

JOURNAL OF FARM ECONOMICS

APRIL, 1922

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Cityward Movement. JNO. G. THOMPSON	65
Outline for Cooperative Marketing. E. G. NOURSE	80
The History of the Development of the Farm Economic Association. H. C. TAYLOR	92
List of Members of the American Farm Economic Association as of April 1, 1922	101
News Notes	121

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY

THE AMERICAN FARM ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

(Formerly the American Farm Management Association)

41 NORTH QUEEN STREET, LANCASTER, PA.

Price: Single Copies, 50 Cents.

Entered as second-class matter, December 11, 1919, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

The American Farm Economic Association

President,—B. H. HIBBARD, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Vice-President,—J. A. FOORD, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.

Secretary-Treasurer,—J. I. FALCONER, College of Agriculture, Columbus, Ohio.

COMMITTEES.

Investigation:

Chairman: H. E. ERDMAN,
Washington, D. C.

Teaching:

Chairman: W. D. NICHOLS,
Lexington, Ky.

Extension:

Chairman: H. M. DIXON,
Washington, D. C.

Experiment Funds and Work:

Chairman: T. P. COOPER,
Lexington, Ky.

Terminology:

Chairman: A. J. DADISMAN, Morgantown, W. Va.

THE JOURNAL OF FARM ECONOMICS, EDITORIAL STAFF.

Editor,—O. C. Stine, Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, Washington, D. C.

Assoc. Editors,—H. M. DIXON, Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, Washington, D. C.

FRANK APP, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

THEODORE MACKLIN, Madison, Wisconsin.

JOURNAL OF FARM ECONOMICS

VOL. IV.

APRIL, 1922.

No. 2

THE CITYWARD MOVEMENT.

JOHN G. THOMPSON,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The march to the city, a movement that has been clearly in evidence for at least a century in this country, still continues unabated. The lines may be laggard here or may even fall back a little there, but the movement as a whole goes resistlessly forward. The Census of 1920 reveals the fact that more than one half of our population now lives in the urban centers—that is, in cities and towns of 2,500 population or more. The urban population, as thus defined, which in 1910 comprised 45.8 per cent of the total population of the country, by 1920 had increased to 51.4 per cent of the total. And if those persons who live in incorporated places of less than 2,500 population be added to the strictly urban population, what may be called “the agglomerated” population of the country comprised 59.9 per cent of the total in 1920. We have no means of knowing just what proportion of our population lived in places of 2,500 and over at the beginning of the national period. But in 1790 only 3.3 per cent of the total population of the country lived in places of 8,000 or over; and by 1820 this proportion had increased to but 4.9 per cent. In 1920, however, 43.8 per cent, or well toward one half the total population of the country, lived in places of this size or above. Moreover, during the decade 1910–1920 the urban population as a whole, as at first defined, increased to the extent of 25.7 per cent, while the rural population increased but 5.4 per cent—the rate per cent increase of the urban population thus having been nearly five times that of the rural population in the last census decade.

While this cityward movement is general for the country as a

whole, it has proceeded to very different lengths in the different geographical sections and divisions. New England, with 79.2 per cent of her population urban, has approximately four out of five persons living in the urban centers—a proportion almost exactly identical with that for England and Wales as a whole. Rhode Island, with 97.5 per cent of her population living in cities and towns of 2,500 or more, ranks first among the States in degree of urbanization, though Massachusetts, with 94.8 per cent urban, is a close second. At the other extreme stands the East South Central States, with but 22.4 per cent of their population living in places of 2,500 or more in 1920. Mississippi, with but 13.4 per cent of her population urban, is the most purely rural of our States, though North Dakota, with 13.6 per cent urban, is a close second. Then follow South Dakota, Arkansas, South Carolina, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Nevada, in order,—all with less than 20 per cent of their population urban.

Moreover, the cityward trend is no less in evidence in many other parts of the world than it is in our own country. Indeed, in some parts of Europe, as in Great Britain and in Germany, that movement has proceeded farther than it has in this country. In England and Wales, in 1911, 78.1 per cent of the population lived in the urban districts; and by 1921 this proportion had increased to 79.3 per cent. Scotland is almost as highly urbanized as England and Wales. Sixty per cent of the total population of the German Empire lived in the urban centers in 1910 (in Saxony the urban population comprised 73 per cent of the total population in 1910). By 1911 the urban population of France had increased to 43.7 per cent of the total population; and since 1846 there had been an absolute decrease in the rural population of that country amounting to over 4,400,000 persons. Austria, in 1910, had about the same proportion of the population urban as France, largely concentrated in the city of Vienna. Belgium is even more highly industrialized and urbanized than France and Austria. And in Italy the ten largest cities increased in population at the rate of 77 per cent during the period 1871–1911, while the increase for that country as a whole, including these cities, amounted to but 29 per cent for the same period. The city population of the Netherlands also grows faster than the rural population, though there is a good annual increase in the latter. In Denmark there was a decided movement toward the city from about the middle of the last century until the beginning of the present century. But in recent years the excess in the urban over the rural increase has been small. (In 1911 the urban population in Denmark amounted to about 40 per

cent of the total population.) In Norway developments have been very similar to those in Denmark, while Sweden and Switzerland have also reflected, in a measure, the cityward trend—as have even the Balkan countries and Russia in minor degree.¹

The cityward trend in Australia has also been very marked and takes the direction, particularly, of disproportionate concentration in the provincial capitals. The six State capitals of Australia are estimated to share between them 42 per cent of the total population of the Commonwealth, and three fifths of the total increase of population during the last ten years occurred in these capital cities. Sydney and Melbourne now contain nearly one half of the total population of New South Wales and of Victoria, respectively. And even in New Zealand the preliminary returns of the recent census show that the four chief towns increased in population to a greater extent than all the rest of the country—rural areas, secondary and small towns—combined.² In Argentina the great city of Buenos Aires occupies a situation quite similar to that held by the capital cities of the Australian provinces (Buenos Aires, however, contains not quite 25 per cent of the population of Argentina). Since 1891 a pronounced movement toward the city has also been in evidence in many parts of Canada, with serious loss in numbers in the rural population in a number of the older eastern provinces and with disproportionately rapid gain in the population of the urban centers even in the western provinces. During the decade 1901–1911 the urban population, officially distinguished as that living in cities, towns, and incorporated villages, increased to the extent of 62.25 per cent, while the rural population, or that living in unincorporated villages and in the open country, increased but 17.16 per cent. During the same period the cities of Winnipeg and Vancouver absorbed about one half, and Montreal and Toronto more than one half, of the total gain in population for their respective provinces.³

In Asia, Japan is rapidly developing her manufacturing and commercial interests with the normal results so far as the concentration of population is concerned; and China and India, which have long contained a certain number of important cities, though still predominantly rural and agricultural, have entered upon the stage of industrial development and, doubtless, upon the era of rapid city growth.

¹ Poland, now no longer a part of Russia, formerly constituted the most highly urbanized part of Russia.

² *Literary Digest*, Sept. 3, 1921, citing the *Wellington Dominion*.

³ The proportion of the urban to the total population in Canada increased from 37.64 per cent, in 1901, to 45.54 per cent, in 1911.

CAUSES OF THE CITYWARD MOVEMENT.

The causes of the cityward movement are, in detail, many and varied and have operated with varying intensity in the various countries, in the different sections of the same country, and also with respect to the various types of individuals who have felt and yielded to the call of the city. Certain commonly asserted important causes of the cityward movement, which either are not at all so operative or even operate in reality in the opposite direction, or else are operative only in a local way and in a degree much more restricted than is commonly recognized, may first be noted. Thus the view that there is necessarily "a swarming" of the excess part of the agricultural population and a settling of this excess in the cities because the operation of the law of diminishing returns in agriculture makes it impossible for that occupation to retain and profitably employ the increased numbers that result from the natural growth of population in the rural districts must be wholly rejected as a real and general cause of the cityward movement. For, in the main, agriculture is occupied in the production of the necessities of life—particularly foodstuffs—and people can be employed in the other occupations only so far as they can be set free from the production of these necessities of agricultural production. But it is clear that the operation of the law of diminishing returns in agriculture must work to diminish the productiveness of human labor and thus to require the retention of a larger proportion of the population in agriculture than would otherwise be required. This asserted cause of the cityward movement thus really operates in the opposite direction. But its influence does work to extend agricultural production from the older into the newer agricultural areas and may thus materially affect the distribution of the agricultural population of the world, as between the different countries and as between the different sections of the same country. For the same reason soil exhaustion must be rejected as a general cause of the cityward movement, though it has often operated to cause a decline in the agricultural population in many separate parts of the world. But for the world as a whole, the greater the degree to which soil exhaustion extends, the larger the proportion of the productive labor of the world that must be employed in agriculture to produce food and other necessities of agricultural production. Soil exhaustion thus really tends, in general, to restrict the cityward movement.

Again, the view that the cityward movement is due, in an important way, to a pushing in of the excess population resulting from a relatively high birth rate and a relatively low death rate, in the rural

districts, to make up for an asserted deficit of population in the cities, resulting from an alleged excess of deaths over births there, must be largely rejected today. At an earlier period, when there was an excessive mortality in many cities, this cause did operate to sustain the actual annual movement of population from country to city and *to prevent a loss of population* in certain cities. But it did not formerly, much less does it today, explain *the positive rapid increase* in the population of a great number of cities. And, especially, it does not explain *the vastly increased proportion of the total population* living in urban centers in general today. Moreover, largely as a result of the practical elimination of the excess of urban over rural mortality in recent years, the excess of births is greater in proportion to the population in the urban districts in this country, and in some of the other countries, than in the rural districts.

Lastly, far too much emphasis has been placed upon the assertion that the farm youth have been educated away from the farm into city life. This is not to deny that the education of the youth in the agricultural districts has been seriously defective, in many cases absolutely unsuited, as a preparation for farm life. But these very defects have largely represented the semi-conscious effort of society to adjust itself to the great fact of the cityward movement itself, already under way as a result of other causes. It certainly would have been no less a mistake to educate a large proportion of the rural youth for farm life than could, under the changing conditions, have been employed there than it was to fail to educate properly for farm life those destined to remain on the farm. Indeed, had rural education been more effective it must have operated actually to promote the cityward trend—a fact to the consideration of which we shall return in another connection.

The most general cause of the cityward movement is to be found in the advantages afforded, through the aggregation of population in a common center, for human coöperation for certain purposes and objects. These advantages, which relate in part to political, in part to social, and in part to economic activities, have always been present, in a measure, and the origin and growth of centers of population from the beginning are doubtless to be traced, in a general way, to this cause. But certain developments in more recent times have operated so as vastly to increase the importance of these advantages for the purpose of what we are today accustomed to regard as the more strictly urban activities, while minimizing these advantages or even eliminating them altogether for the more strictly agricultural operations to which they also pertained, in no small measure, in earlier

times. To trace the developments associated with these changes, even in the barest outline, would be entirely impossible in such a paper as this. We must therefore be content to point out some of the principal factors involved in this movement.

The coming of the new order of things was closely associated with the development of geographical and occupational division of labor. The earliest factor making for the growth of large centers of population, as distinguished from mere villages and towns, and one which is still very important relative to the same end, was trade. Now trade, even of a primitive kind, assumes a certain development of human division of labor, particularly of a geographical or territorial character. But the adaptability of production along certain lines to the application of mechanical power, on an increasingly large scale and in an ever more highly concentrated degree, to which a dispersive occupation like modern agriculture was not, and is not adapted, afforded a basis for a progressive disassociation of these former lines from the strictly agricultural operations, with which they had long been combined, in the main, and contributed to concentrate them in certain places where still other advantages, such as favorable location with reference to raw materials and markets, could be realized. The perfecting of efficient modern methods of transportation and of communication by water, by land, and finally by air, was, of course, an indispensable factor in these developments—as also in affording adequate supplies of food for a population that is not self-sustaining in this respect. Moreover, these agencies of transportation and of communication are themselves well served by the advantages that concentration and agglomeration afford, and thus become, in turn, important city-building factors in a direct and immediate sense through the centering of their activities, in large measure, in the urban centers. These developments gradually removed from the sphere of the agriculturist the functions of manufacture and of transportation and transferred them for performance to the growing centers of population. On the other hand, a part of the farm population had been gradually released for employment elsewhere through this progressive narrowing of farm activities to the more strictly agricultural operations and through the introduction and growing use of labor-saving machinery, of urban make, in agriculture. And as the distribution of population is primarily determined by the distribution of employment or of occupation, we find in this series of developments the earliest and most evident of the causes of the modern trend of population from country to city.

But this transfer, from farm to city, of certain employments formerly associated with farm work did not end its influence upon the cityward trend with the corresponding transfer, to the cities, of a part of the farm population proportional to the amount of labor previously bestowed upon those activities on the farm. If this had been all, the cityward movement must have come to a substantial halt years ago. But this transfer resulted in the separation from farm work of those employments which, due to the nature of the demand for their products, are capable of almost indefinite expansion—given due variety and essential cheapness in production and adequate purchasing power on the part of consumers. On the other hand, employment on the farm was more and more reduced to the production of the absolute necessities of life, especially food supplies, for which there is an almost inexorable demand irrespective of cost up to a certain point, but beyond which point there is practically no additional *total* demand by a given population, however fine the quality, varied the character, low the price of these necessities, or however adequate the purchasing power of consumers.⁴ As a result of this circumstance the use of "labor-saving" machinery in the city industries is really "product-increasing" and not "labor-saving," while its use on the farm is really "labor-saving." Every further improvement in the efficiency of human labor in modern agriculture, therefore, be it due to the use of more and better labor-saving machinery, to higher intelligence on the part of farm operators and producers, to a better technique or an improved business organization and management, to the elimination of animal diseases and insect pests, or to what-not, must, under present conditions, inexorably tend, *for the world as a whole*, in the direction of a *proportional* reduction of numbers in agriculture and a corresponding *proportional* increase in the number

⁴ This statement, while substantially accurate in the main, needs some qualification. It is evident, of course, that though the total demand for food products in general, in the world as a whole, is affected in small degree by a change in price, the market demand in a given country—especially for a given food product—may be greatly affected by such change through the agency of the export trade. Change of price also affects the extent to which one food product is used rather than another. Moreover, agriculture is also engaged in the production of the raw materials for clothing—particularly cotton and wool; and for clothing there is not the same rigidity of demands as for food products. Lastly, the total demand for food is itself not absolutely rigid, as it is affected in some degree by waste and by underconsumption and overconsumption. Those who are interested in a further discussion of this phase of the subject are referred to an article, by the writer of this paper, in *The Journal of Political Economy*, for February, 1916, under the title of "The Nature of the Demand for Agricultural Products."

of those employed in the expansive city industries.⁵ On the other hand, the further development of the use of so-called labor-saving devices in the city industries and occupations, already developed to a degree far beyond that which obtains in agriculture, is for the reasons stated not inconsistent with a further proportional increase in the urban population.

In the causes that have thus led to the transfer of the expansive industries and employments from the farm to the city and to the retention on the farm of those employments for which there is comparatively a rigidly limited demand, we find the main impetus back of the cityward movement. And the so-called defects of rural education have, in large measure, grown out of a half-conscious attempt on the part of the rural community and of the State to work out an adjustment with reference to this movement. The latter has not been, in material degree, the result of defective rural education. Indeed, an education that would have made the farm population more efficient producers must, so far, have promoted the rural exodus, as its influence would have been quite analogous to that of a labor-saving device.

Many other causes, usually less general and less ultimate in character than those to which attention has just been called, have contributed to further the cityward movement. For one thing, more people are required on the farm when land is first reclaimed from the forest and brought into cultivation and when farm structures and other necessary farm improvements must be created than are required later when all these improvements have been effected. Again, in our own country, occupation and settlement began with the areas that were less fertile and less easily cultivable and extended later to those areas that were more fertile and that were much better adapted to the introduction and use of labor-saving machinery. This circumstance, of course, contributed to diminish the proportion of the population required to provide subsistence for the population as a whole. The comparatively long hours of labor and relatively arduous character of the work, generally speaking, on the farm, especially for women in the farm home, and the relatively smaller remuneration for the same grade of capacity and for the same degree of effort, have each exer-

⁵ Increase in the total population of the world, requiring an increase in the production of food, may check the tendency toward an *absolute decline* in the number of those employed in agriculture—or, especially if the law of diminishing returns should operate sharply, even require an increase in the total number employed on the farm. But under the conditions stated, the trend toward a further *proportional* decline in the number of those employed on the farm is inevitable.

cised an important immediate influence. But the first and last of these influences can be traced, in considerable degree, to the inferior opportunity that the rural community affords for effective coöperation and organization on the part of the farm population. Moreover, the influence of other and more ultimate causes has frequently manifested itself superficially in the form of relatively low returns in agriculture—as when the rapid introduction of labor-saving machinery, or the rapid opening up of new and fertile areas for cultivation, or a combination of both circumstances, or the sudden failure of the foreign market, as within the past year, has contributed to a condition of over-production and excessive decline in price. Excessive decline in the price of agricultural products also almost always reflects the peculiar nature of the demand for these products, as a result of which a comparatively small surplus, or deficit, has a disproportionately large influence upon the price.

Then political causes have exerted an influence. The Peloponnesian War in Greece drove the rural population into the cities, where they afterwards were inclined to remain. Rome, in her palmy days, contained a vast number of functionaries, and the tributes of grain that were received from subject countries and distributed freely to the populace attracted a numerous rabble. The insecurity of the feudal period rendered the manorial village and the walled town practically universal. The wars in which this country has been engaged have usually given an impetus to industrial development and thus to city life. The recent World War certainly stimulated city growth in France, and very probably in this country also.⁶ And before the recent war the military training which reservists in Germany and in France received is said to have been an inciting cause of the rural exodus, because it brought the youth of those countries into contact with city life. In this country the government land policy and government aid to internal improvements hastened the opening up of the fertile areas of the West, stimulated trade and manufactures in the cities, rendered agriculture unprofitable in the older agricultural regions, and thus gave a special impetus to the cityward trend in the East. Again, while the wealth of natural resources basic to industry and the encouragement afforded by a numerous and opulent population would, in any case, have ultimately led to a large industrial and urban development in this country, it is clear that our protective tariff policy, through the subsidy offered to manufactures, has hastened this development and has thus afforded a considerable impetus to the city-

⁶ An opposite influence was probably exerted—at least temporarily—in England.

ward movement. Nominally, agriculture has been supposed to share in the protection afforded by the tariff. But in point of fact the agricultural class as a whole has never been able, for various reasons, to realize the advantages which the tariff has been supposed to afford to agriculture—a fact never more strikingly demonstrated than by the lamentable failure of the present “emergency tariff” to bring relief to that occupation. On the other hand, as consumers, agriculturists have been penalized by the protection extended to manufactures.

Then there are the conveniences and advantages that location in the centers of population affords to a great number of miscellaneous activities and enterprises—educational, scientific, journalistic, religious, propagandist, and promotional in general. Agricultural colleges are usually located at or near some center of population. An agricultural journal of importance could scarcely be published from a small village or from the open country. Even back-to-the-land or forward-to-the-land movements usually function from some urban center! And it is of interest that this body holds the sessions of its annual meeting in this great industrial center, with its nearly three-score of surrounding satellite cities and towns, and that we are here today considering this question.

Lastly, we have to recognize the fact of human gregariousness—that man is a social animal. And in this connection the greatly superior opportunity that the urban environment affords for social contact, in its various aspects, counts heavily against the isolation of the countryside.

RESULTS.

To the writer of this paper the results of the cityward movement appear, on the whole, to have been beneficial—both to the community at large and the State, and to the agricultural class itself. In spite of the fear, so frequently expressed over many years in the past, that the movement threatens impending famine, there is every reason to believe that the people of the world were, in general, never so well fed and clothed as they were at the beginning of the recent World War. And if there are tens of millions of starving people in the world at this time, that circumstance can scarcely be charged to the cityward movement. For these starving millions are to be found, not in the highly urbanized countries, but in those great areas where the urbanizing movement has made little headway as yet, where the normal condition is that of a great surplus of agricultural products for export, and where economic, social, and political conditions are still profoundly disturbed by the titanic upheaval caused by the war.

Today, after a cityward movement of more than one hundred years that has made this nation of over 105,000,000 people more than one half urban, corn is once again the fuel in many of the farm homes of the Corn Belt; and our farmers are experiencing the greatest financial distress as a result of their inability to dispose of, at even greatly reduced prices, their surpluses of the other great farm products. Want and distress, to repeat, are widely prevalent today—even, in some measure, in this fortunate country of ours. To a certain extent, therefore, the situation in which the farmer finds himself today is due to a condition of underconsumption rather than to a condition of overproduction. Moreover, as already indicated, in arguing from an observed reduction in the price of agricultural products we are very likely to overestimate the extent of the surplus which has caused the price reduction, in view of the fact that surpluses and deficits in the case of the necessities of life exert a disproportionately great influence upon price. Yet, when all possible allowance is made, it can scarcely be maintained that we are suffering today from underproduction in agriculture.

On the other hand, the development of great consuming populations in the urban centers has brought to the farmer, under normal conditions, profitable markets, relief from a chronic condition of excessive competition and overproduction, and encouragement to improved methods of production. And the agricultural class has shared not fully nor fairly, perhaps, but yet in considerable degree, in the general increase in well-being. The country is still exploited, in the economic sphere, by the city, but exercises, in turn, the rather futile privilege of interfering in the political affairs of the urban centers. Unfortunately, the profoundly disturbing and disorganizing effects of the cityward movement upon the social life and institutions of the rural community have been as yet only partially remedied. And it is in this sphere that the really hurtful effects of the trend to the city upon rural life are manifest.

Again, there has been an extraordinary decline in the death rate coincident with the cityward movement; and it is not too much to say that the modern health movement has been overwhelmingly an urban movement. Moreover, no one who traces the course of political and constitutional development and makes a careful survey of political conditions today in the highly urbanized and in the overwhelmingly rural countries can indorse the view that the cityward movement has had an unfavorable effect in the political sphere. Lastly, although the millennium is evidently by no means yet at hand, there is substan-

tial evidence to show that there has been a gradual rise in ethical, moral, and religious standards.

REMEDIES.

What of remedies? Many persons urgently assert the need of taking measures to turn back the tide that is running so strongly toward the city. But it is a question whether anything can be done substantially to control such a movement. The student of the operation of the social and economic forces comes to have a very wholesome respect for their tremendously potent, persistent, and far-reaching character. He observes, with much interest, that very many of those who inveigh against this movement themselves respond to the compelling influence of its underlying forces. "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further" is almost as far beyond the sphere of finite control for the tides of this movement as it is for the tides of the ocean. For twenty centuries it has mocked the recurring attempts to fix its limits. Moreover, the absence of predicted catastrophe, over so long a period, tends strongly to bear out the conclusion already reached that the movement has been, on the whole, beneficial. Both the futility and the disutility of the proposal to reverse this movement are revealed when it is reduced to its real meaning—that agriculture should discard its improved and labor-saving implements and processes and should revert toward the stage of the hand sickle and the winnowing sheet; that the factory should be abolished and the spinning wheel and the hand loom restored to the farm home and the village shop; that the farmer should once more become "a jack of all trades," should wagon his small surplus of grain 50 to 100 miles to an uncertain market and almost as laboriously bring back with him the few and narrowly assorted articles that he did not produce for himself, should conduct his droves of sheep or of hogs or of cattle a month's journey to distant slaughtering grounds with a limited outlet; in short, that the whole course of industrial evolution should be turned back, or at least halted.

No one, of course, is urging such extreme measures. Of course not—when it is seen what the proposal involves. But a check to the cityward movement certainly involves the cessation of the further operation of the causes that have led toward the city; and a substantial return to the land would necessarily involve a substantial movement in the direction of the more primitive conditions to which attention has just been called.

On the whole the control of the movement must be left to the

reacting influence of the same class of forces that have caused it: underproduction in agriculture, definite and persistent rise in the price of farm products as compared with the price of city products, an equal or superior degree of prosperity and equal or superior conditions of life in general on the farm; in the city industries and occupations, overproduction, falling prices and incomes, industrial depression and increased cost of living, and less tolerable conditions of life in general in the cities. These corrective forces may be trusted to work surely. But they may work somewhat ruthlessly; and in spite of the resources that modern society can bring to its own relief, an adjustment made by these forces alone is likely to involve a certain amount of shock. No man is wise enough to say when the movement has gone far enough or whether it has gone too far. How far it should go in a given country depends in large degree upon the extent to which a country is to be self-sufficing in respect to food supplies. But this is a factor that is of less significance for the world as a whole. If England and Belgium, for example, were to become more rural through becoming self-sufficing in respect to food supplies, then Argentina and Canada, and perhaps the United States, who export agricultural products to the former countries, must become less rural—that is, presumably more urban. But whatever be the proper limit of the movement, mere momentum may carry it too far for the adjustment to be made with comfort by the natural corrective factors.⁷

The proper sphere of human intervention, then, in respect to the cityward movement would appear to be the taking of such measures, in advance, as would seem designed to ease or relieve the shock of adjustment, if and when it comes. Every proper measure for making and keeping country life prosperous, satisfying, and attractive would have this effect incidentally, while being of the utmost importance in its main and most important effect. Shorter hours of labor are much to be desired on the farm. And, other things remaining equal, such an outcome might also require a larger proportion of the population on the farm. The development of the coöperative movement in agriculture, when directed toward legitimate objects and utilized in a defensive way, may be exceedingly helpful, as Denmark has notably shown, in realizing the advantages that have just been mentioned.

⁷ It is significant, as illustrating, in some degree, the operation of these natural regulative forces, that in England and Wales, where the urbanizing movement has gone farthest, the relative increase in the urban, and in the rural population, which was 15.2 per cent and 2.9 per cent, respectively, for the decade 1891-1901, was 11.1 per cent and 10.2 per cent, respectively, for 1901-11, and 5.2 per cent and 4.3 per cent, respectively, for 1911-21.

Used in a selfish or harmful way, it might react to the great injury of agriculture.

On the other hand, every effort that will be helpful toward the retaining and promoting, on the part of the urban population, of a contact with and a knowledge of the activities of rural life is to be commended. To this end the writer of this paper believes that the teaching of agriculture in the city and town schools, the promotion of school and community garden work, the encouragement of fruit growing, and even of the keeping of chickens, in towns and cities, are of the utmost importance. These activities may be made educative in the best sense of the word, in a general way; they tend toward the retention of areas of open space in the urban centers—a highly desirable feature in itself; they may be made to contribute appreciably to the subsistence of the family in town; and they may render the transition back to rural life less difficult if the time should come when, as a result of a real and undoubted overdevelopment of city life, a return to the land should be required.

Lastly, we should discontinue a tariff policy which, whatever be the intention, still favors the city industries at the expense of agriculture. At best a tariff that would protect everybody would protect nobody. A man who tugs with equal force at the straps of both boots will not succeed in elevating one foot above the other—much less in elevating himself above the floor. But if the tariff boost exerts a stronger upward pull upon the manufacturing boot than upon the agricultural boot, it is clear that the latter will be depressed relative to the former. If we really wish to elevate the agricultural boot, we should, at the least, let go of the straps of the manufacturing boot altogether. But the possibility of carrying out a policy of protection for agricultural products only, in a country with a popular government and with a population more than one half urban, is extremely problematical. Moreover, the absurdity of attempting to "protect" the great agricultural export lines in this country, such as the growing of cotton, of the cereals, and of tobacco, is, or ought to be, clearly manifest. And to divert land, labor, and capital from these and allied lines to the naturally less well-adapted and naturally less profitable uses of wool growing and the growing of sugar-cane and sugar-beets would not materially increase the population upon the soil, while it would seriously reduce the productivity of the factors of production in agriculture. Also, it should be noted that Denmark and Holland, which of all the countries have best solved the problem of maintaining rural development on a parity with urban development, have long been on practically a free-trade basis.

DISCUSSION.

Professor Carver expressed general agreement with the views presented in the paper, but voiced the opinion that the results of the cityward movement have not been favorable in the political sphere. He said that real democracy is possible only among a self-employing population, and that the writer of the paper was probably basing his conclusion that the political results had not been unfavorable upon conditions in the mediæval period, when the rural population was not self-employing while the town population was self-employing, and that the conditions have now in a measure been reversed.

Another speaker asked whether or not the movement to the city was caused by lack of employment.

The writer of the paper replied that he did not think that lack of employment, in the sense in which the speaker appeared to use the term, in the country was a cause of the movement to the city. Continuing, he said: "There have been certain causes that have appeared to promote the cityward movement in certain cases, but these causes have been wholly absent in other cases, where the movement has been just as pronounced. Therefore, such seeming causes have not been real and general causes.

"I can not agree with Professor Carver's view. I do not wish to base my conclusions as to this point upon conditions in mediæval times. We can compare conditions today in countries like England, France, and the United States with those existing in Mexico, and in certain of the Central American and South American countries. Not a few persons in this country whose opinions are entitled to respect believe that England, where the cityward movement has gone farthest, has a more democratic government than we have in the United States. Further, there is no class that has so little political independence as the really dependent class in the rural community. Their every act is known to those upon whom they are dependent for employment. They can not readily organize for their own protection and independence as the city workers can and do. Lastly, they are dependent upon a single person, or upon a very few persons, for employment, while the workers in the cities have a larger opportunity to shift employment to other employers, and are thus more able to be independent in this respect."

THE OUTLOOK FOR COOPERATIVE MARKETING.

E. G. NOURSE,

IOWA STATE COLLEGE.

Coöperation is a form of business organization which has emerged in the slow evolution of economic institutions to meet the needs of the complex life of today. It is destined, I believe, to play a part as large and as brilliant as that of the old-line corporation and the "trust" so-called. Among the various lines of business to which the coöperative form of organization may be applied, agriculture stands out as the one of greatest importance thus far and will perhaps always remain so. And within the industry of agriculture, marketing is the functional division within which coöperative organization bids fair to find its largest field of usefulness. I am bound to feel, therefore, that the outlook for coöperative marketing presents a broad and inspiring view.

But however great one's faith in the ultimate outcome of coöperative marketing, he must be pardoned if some doubts assail him from time to time with reference to the immediate outlook. The movement sometimes seems in danger, if not of being "killed with kindness," at least of suffering serious damage at the hands of its too ardent friends. As one returns home now and again from the glowing fellowship of coöperative conferences where propagandists have promised miracles of marketing reform swiftly brought to pass under coöperative auspices, one wonders whether we should indeed go digging for this pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, or whether we could perhaps wield spade and hoe to better purpose in our own back-yard potato patch. Looking about at the stumbling and sometimes even destructive efforts of the mere human beings to whom we must look for the bringing of this promised millennium to pass, one realizes that it is a condition and not a theory which confronts us.

From *quantitative data* of achievement, furnished by estimates of the thousands of associations, the hundreds of thousands of members, the millions of dollars' worth of goods handled, we are constrained to turn our thoughts to the *qualitative problem* of whether the flow of goods to market is actually rendered more orderly, more expeditious, more economical, in a word more efficient by these new agencies.

Success is a relative term, and in attempting to apply a measure to the achievements of coöperation we must bear clearly in mind the two quite different ideals which have been set up as possible objectives of the movement. Baldly stated, these two goals proposed by American coöperators are, on the one hand, centralized market control and, on the other, decentralized business organization for the more efficient standardization, assembly, and market distribution of farm products. Obviously, these two ideals are not antithetical nor even mutually exclusive. But they do differ materially and significantly in general outlook and intention as well as in methods of procedure. They differ in degree and particularly in the length of time which enters into their considerations.

To waste no words, then, I shall state it as my conviction that the outlook for coöperative marketing after the first of these patterns is extremely bad. Several specific projects of this kind are definitely before us at the present time, aiming to set up a national agency for administering the market supply of a given class of products so as to "control" or "stabilize" the market in the interest of their members. In their first and worst form they proposed to "fix prices" on a cost plus basis through control of seventy-five per cent or some other necessary fraction of the product. Fortunately, they have in general now receded from this position, but still are pinning an enormous and naïve faith to promises of vast improvement in prices to be brought about through statistical bureaus of impossible omniscience and through supply manipulation of dubious efficacy and of uncertain physical and financial practicability.

It would be extremely unfortunate if the interest in and enthusiasm for coöperative marketing which is being manifested at the present time were to be largely dissipated in attempts to do the impossible at the terminal market, whilst the necessary work of organizing the producing territory solidly and effectively was neglected. But it appears that just that mistake is being made today by several prominent agencies which have been entrusted with the leadership of the farmers' marketing movement. As for myself, I can not see in their proposals the reflection of a true understanding of the nature of the price-making process or the character and extent of present defects or abuses in our marketing machinery. On the other hand, there is a dangerous under-emphasis of the great and difficult task of organizing the rank and file of producers so as to carry out comprehensively and effectively such plans of coördination as really are called for. It seems, for instance, to be assumed that there is now a suitably

organized coöperative elevator system functioning efficiently over the producing area and ready to gear in promptly and effectively into these central market agencies. Or it is assumed that a like desirable condition maintains today or can be promptly brought about in the live-stock industry. The fact is that the farmers' elevator movement, despite its very real and very great achievements and its undoubted permanence, has not really worked out the problems of coöperative local grain handling, but represents a partially mutualized private business, whose commercial management is on a level probably a little lower than the low plane of small-town business in general, and is, moreover, just coming to grips with certain internal difficulties which have been silently gathering force for some years and are inherent in their general scheme of organization. The live-stock shipping movement is so young as to be in most places only a provisional form of organization which has hardly worked out suitable principles of organization, to say nothing of the subsequent problems of successful management. Conditions amongst local coöperative dairy organizations are possibly a little, but only a little, better than either of the above. I doubt if it is essentially different in cotton, tobacco, or any of the other products for which "national" plans have been proposed.

The chief weakness in recent large-scale proposals (aside from a faulty price philosophy) has been a failure to judge the size of the business unit necessary for efficiency. Possibly because of their initial impetus in the direction of price-fixing they have been unable to orient themselves to the idea that effective work can be done on less than a national scale. In the fear of making their zone of operations smaller than the scope of their marketing problem, they have run past themselves and included essentially separate industries, diverse interests, and geographically remote and economically competitive areas. This not only complicates their marketing task unduly, but also sows the seeds of dissension, instead of coördinating such an area and scope of business as is inherently susceptible of unification.

It is noteworthy that no project of large-scale coöperative marketing is launched without great stress being laid on the allegation that it is "built from the ground up." In a number of outstanding cases, however, this appears upon examination to be mere lip service to a worthy ideal whose real meaning has unfortunately been missed. In point of fact evidently chief attention and effort were devoted to planning the crowning glories of a central marketing scheme, after which a few proposals for connecting this with the grower were

rather hastily sketched in. If a parable may be permitted, I would voice a fear lest these architects are proposing to build a massive dome, heavy with stone-work, ornate with carving, and glittering afar with gold-leaf, but set upon a quite inadequate substructure, its walls in places only just begun, in others cracked and broken, and the whole never designed to carry such a superstructure. Possibly the pertinent question is whether we do not need just now to build plain but commodious working quarters rather than to let our interest and effort run so much to dome and pinnacle.

In its ultimate development coöperative organization should, to be sure, afford the means whereby the achievements of big business are made available to the farming industry. But we must not be so dazzled by the swift and sweeping victories of certain great captains of industry as to expect exactly to duplicate their exploits either in magnitude or in speed. It is well to remember that the trust builders dealt with business units already grown large and solid through many years of development under the hands of trained and selected business men. They had become entrenched in financial power and, under their centralized plan of organization, a quite small number of individuals were delegated plenary powers to pledge and to deliver the support of a whole industry. Farmers, even when they coöperate, propose to retain a maximum of individual independence. The "man on horseback" has no place in the rural coöperative scheme of things. But in freeing ourselves from such domination and the frequent abuse of the autocrat's power we must likewise forego the hope of seeing great results achieved in the grand manner. We must take up the burden of slower education and discipline of great democratic masses such as will in time weld them into orderly, self-controlled bodies moving forward slowly but with irresistible force and with unbreakable tenacity.

One particularly unfortunate result of the present over-promoted phase of coöperative marketing development is that great numbers of people who naturally can not be expected to be accurately informed as to the inward meaning of these events will leap to the conclusion that the coöperative principle has been discredited by the collapse of some of these too ambitious schemes. The enemies of coöperation will be swift to capitalize these doubts and the farmer's natural dissatisfaction at having sunk some hundreds of thousands of dollars in such ephemeral experiments at a time when he can ill afford the loss.

Such an occasion, however, merely presents the testing time of true coöperators and throws down a challenge to rural leadership. I

take it that most of us in this meeting have some fairly definite connection with the coöperative movement. It was our duty to stand steadily and clear-headedly by that post in the wild rush which has been going on toward impossible objectives. Now, when the retreating tide breaks back upon us, it will be our duty even more emphatically to stand manfully by that post to stem the backward flood that it may not become a rout. If you believe as sincerely as I do in the efficiency of the coöperative principle as a means of helping the farmer to better his marketing service, you will bend your backs to the task of digging in at the most advanced point we can hope permanently to hold, consolidating any actual gains that have been made. In sound teaching, both within and without the walls of our respective colleges, by practical and penetrating investigation of the countless problems that coöperative marketing organizations are called upon to cope with, by wise counsel to those who seek our advice, by broad and sound training of those who are now or during the next few years become our students, we can do much toward perfecting methods, improving leadership, and informing the rank and file, and through all this to strengthen the cause of coöperation.

This launches me upon the pleasanter, because constructive, part of my paper. And we may well begin by setting down those things which we may hope to see put over in this present cycle of the coöperative movement. The earlier propaganda period in our father's generation, besides a considerable amount of rainbow-chasing and some costly blunders, did at least establish some familiarity with the idea that farmers might organize their selling function jointly on the coöperative plan. After the wave of reaction had swept away a considerable amount of state buying, and grain export, and manufacturing business, there still were left a substantial number of local coöperative assembling, processing, and shipping associations, whose members proceeded doggedly to work out by experience the principles and methods necessary to the successful prosecution of the business upon which they had embarked. During the last few years many new producers' groups have decided to embark in the coöperative marketing business and are much in need of having the lessons of these earlier pioneers brought to their attention, and in every way possible both old and new local associations must be helped to put their work on a thoroughly business-like basis. The weakness at the foundation of the coöperative structure today is the lack of expert business management in the local association. This amateur character of the work must be superseded by standardization of business

practice along professional lines, accurate and adequate record keeping, intelligent study of market outlets, price trends and buyers' preferences, improvement in product, and technical efficiency in handling it. Along with this there is much work to be done in the legal organization or reorganization of these associations along sound coöperative lines and in the proper adjustment of their finances.

Somewhat paradoxically, you can not, by and large, in the average of cases, get proper organization and proficient management of local associations through local agencies merely. You must have some sort of overhead organization to develop and apply standards of management as well as product and to render certain specialized services which the local can not secure for itself economically, if at all. If coöperators are going to compete with other business on even terms or better, they must set in motion agencies which will improve the technique of the business and set up a strong system under which a not too highly salaried local man can get effective results without having to contribute much beyond the faithful following of a prescribed routine, extraordinary proficiency being available through experts when needed.

These overhead service organizations must develop in areas which give them some definite commercial reason for existence, producing or transportation or market district in many cases, a state unit in others, but not a national organization, at least not for some time to come. (National *conferences* of local and regional organizations, either at regular intervals or on special occasions, would doubtless be productive of much good.)

The perfecting of local associations along truly coöperative lines and with professional standards of management, all coördinated within such regional or state systems as to give a suitable unit of efficiency—this seems to be the proper point at which the present phase of the coöperative movement might properly aspire to set the goal of its achievement and the distinctive contribution of the present generation.

Included in this program should be such a development of actual market distribution or terminal sale as can definitely justify itself and become established in the face of the keen competition of existing wholesale agencies. How much this must be will depend on the nature of the marketing process for each particular commodity, but, in my judgment, need embrace only a comparatively small fraction of the product in most cases. Many of our coöperative schemes are launched with a promise that they will set up agencies which will in

time cause all the given product to be marketed through this coöperation channel. Personally, I doubt that this is the most practicable ideal. The coöperative agency should set up an alternative channel which prevents the domination of private marketing institutions with their possibility of inefficiency of service or exploitation of the producer or the public. But after the coöperative organization has established effective competition, further progress to the elimination of private agencies is quite as likely to be harmful as to be productive of further good. The coöperative itself needs private competition to keep it from resting on its oars and lapsing back into the easy ways of inefficiency. Or, on the other hand, there is needed the alternative channel of private trade to keep even coöperation from becoming monopolistic and exploitative.

In brief, then, the outlook for coöperative marketing will be bright or dim in proportion as we succeed in perfecting the organization of country shipping, on the one hand, and, to a lesser degree quantitatively, the processes of central market selling on a coöperative basis. We must not forget that the technique of coöperative organization and operation is slower and more difficult than any other business form, but once it is perfected outruns and outlasts the others. Especially in a country as vast and as diversified as ours, geographically, socially, racially, economically, is this true. Denmark offers no proper analogy for what we are talking about.

There are many reasons to be encouraged as to the prospect for solving the problem just mentioned with reasonable promptness and in a satisfactory way. My chief reason for this optimism is due to the fact that we have established on a pretty adequate basis most of the specific agencies needed for working this process out. A generation ago there were only one or two laws that even sought to provide for coöperative business, and they did so but lamely at best. Twenty coöperative laws were passed by the last legislative sessions of our various States and some forty-two now have such laws, many of them quite satisfactory. Furthermore, lawyers are becoming acquainted with the nature and needs of this form of organization and in the process of time we shall surely see the cases of coöperative organizations skillfully presented before judges who actually understand the nature of the business upon which they are passing judgment. Likewise, as an increasing volume of business comes under the coöperative form of organization, this becomes a field for the well-trained young business man. If opportunities for promotion in relatively large coöperative systems are opened up, we may expect to

see a type of personnel develop here which in skill and training will equal that of private business and will doubtless excell them in ideals of service. Furthermore, the individual banker, finding an enlarging field of credit growing up in connection with coöperative marketing agencies, and finding more and more competent business men in charge, applies himself to the task of understanding this business and making his bank serve its financial needs. There is a hopeful outlook today that, where existing credit agencies are unable to render this service adequately, new institutions or new procedures will be developed to remove this disability.

Finally, since we are a gathering here of college and departmental employees, it may not be out of place to mention also the help being rendered by the investigational and teaching activities of the institutions which we represent. We have already gathered a considerable body of investigational data, which should give some scientific basis for understanding the movement in its different manifestations and of guiding future efforts along right lines. In the future we should go much further with this work, which, if done wisely, should make the outlook for coöperative endeavor much brighter than in the old day when there was but the scantiest literature on the subject and that inspirational rather than scientific.

There should be no misunderstanding of our position with reference to the movement. If we keep our activities on a proper professional plane, we need have no apologies for our participation in coöperative affairs. It is the proper task of the trained economist to work for the progress of economic institutions. Our lives are not mortgaged to the maintenance of the status quo and the protection of vested interests. If we can be instrumental in adapting the coöperative form of business organization to the betterment of the farmer's marketing service, that is our duty. We may have regrets, but not compunctions, for any inconvenience that particular individuals may experience in readjusting their private affairs to this march of progress.

Even though we are using public funds secured by the taxation of all the people, no proper objection can lie against our work if it is really constructive in character. For then the whole public benefits from the economy and increased efficiency brought about. But if we are blind leaders of the blind, encouraging farmers who are not ready for it to embark in business at a point or on a basis which offers no real prospect of saving, if we fail to point out the pitfalls and show them the straight and narrow path to commercial success, then we

shall be blameworthy both in their eyes and those of the public. For coöperation then will mean dashing into business to make a failure for themselves and a mess for the regular trade, the business, after a costly period of disruption, going back into the hands of those professionally competent to handle it. Many a farmer whose eyes have been opened to the truths of science, so far as natural processes are concerned, is still in the age of superstition as to economic processes, and hence an easy prey to the quack and the promoter. At a time when "coöperation" is the popular catchword, many nostrums with the coöperative label are bound to be peddled in the rural districts. The outlook for coöperative marketing will be much improved if spurious or doubtful goods are exposed and eliminated.

DISCUSSION: H. W. MOORHOUSE, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

I read Professor Nourse's admirable paper last evening and have written down the few remarks I want to make. I wish that I had more time in which to prepare a more studied statement.

You are disappointed that President Howard is not here. He wanted me to tell you that he is sorry that he can not talk to you on this subject of coöperative marketing.

The Farm Bureau program can be said to be threefold:

1. Economic—with the emphasis on coöperative marketing.
2. Educational—with the stress laid on economic education.
3. Legislative—the legislation used merely as an ally of the economic program.

The economic feature of the work comes first in the minds of the Farm Bureau leaders. To make this successful, education is essential, and some legislation is necessary, but it should be understood that legislation is secondary. The Farm Bureau believes in self-help and wants government action only as a means to that end.

The American Farm Bureau Federation starts with the premise that it is within the province of farmers not only to produce commodities, but also to perform some of the functions of market distribution, and that individually they can not perform these functions effectively. The corporation is the instrument to which they naturally turn in performing the work of marketing. For many reasons, unnecessary to discuss here, the corporation organized on coöperative principles best lends itself to the farmer's use.

I agree with Professor Nourse that the coöperative corporation is to play an increasingly large and brilliant part in the business life of this country. I expect to see it used not only on the marketing side of agriculture, but in some other lines of industry. Taking into account the limitations of coöperation, I still see no fundamental reason why our large corporations in the packing business, for instance, should not be organized on coöperative principles. Why should not the 35,000 stockholders of Swift & Company be cattle raisers who share in the profits according to patronage and who control the company democratically.

I believe in coöperation first because I believe in democracy. I want to see democratic principles carried over into business. I think that democracy in government will be more successful when it is practiced also in industry. Even if the management of the local coöperative society may, at times, be less efficient, as Professor Nourse suggested, than the small-town business, I still want coöperation. It is entirely conceivable that a wise autocrat could give us much better government than we democratically give ourselves, but in spite of the defects we are not willing to relinquish our democratic form of government.

I believe in coöperation also because it diffuses wealth and minimizes so-called profiteering. With the unrest in this country, and particularly in the balance of the world, due partly to extremes in economic conditions, this point is driven home to us now. We do not need to be socialists to believe that there is a happy mean in the division of wealth which will strengthen us as a nation, and as individuals will make us all more contented. It is my thought that coöperation will be an important agency in promoting a high general standard of life.

If I understand Professor Nourse correctly, while he is an enthusiast for the coöperative ideal and a believer in the long-run results, he is fearful of the immediate outcome of specific projects sponsored quite largely recently by the American Farm Bureau Federation. It seems to me too early to make predictions. In so far as any national organization such as the U. S. Grain Growers, Inc. expects to accomplish too much in too short a time, it will undoubtedly meet disappointment and must modify its plans to build slowly and surely. If the U. S. Grain Growers, Inc. has hoped too much, we can only trust that the discouragement which comes from experience will not be too great. The main idea is right, but in carrying it out it may be that the attempt was made to cover too much territory.

I think I may say that the Farmers' Livestock Committee of Fifteen, whose plan was recently ratified, seemed to feel that the U. S. Grain Growers, Inc. had been too ambitious, and therefore the livestock men are starting more conservatively. I think that will be true of the dairy organization, the fruit organization, and all other organizations fostered in any way by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There has been too much misunderstanding about the "control" of commodities by national associations of producers. I was disappointed to hear Professor Nourse use the term "fix prices." The American Farm Bureau Federation does not want to fix prices in the sense that term implies. Do we or do we not believe in more stable, less violently fluctuating prices? What do we mean by a stable price? One completely rigid forever? I think not. Do we not mean a price that fluctuates very little, or perhaps not at all, over a given period of time, possibly one month, three months, or six months, varying with different commodities and circumstances? I think such a price would be an improvement over a constantly changing price. I see no reason for daily fluctuations in the price of any commodity. Is not the function of price to keep production and consumption properly adjusted to each other? Is the daily fluctuation in the price of wheat, for example, essential in performing that service?

I do not understand that coöperative associations ever intended to set aside the law of supply and demand. Supply and demand, like the calculations of costs referred to yesterday, are results of judgment. Should not farmers as intelligent business men place themselves in a position to exercise sound judgments in regard to supply of and demand for their commodities. It seems natural to me that farmers should want to possess their own storage reservoirs, arrange for their credit advances, and feed the market in an intelligent manner according to information collected and analyzed by their own men. A coöperative grain concern handling, say, 100 million bushels of wheat in an orderly way would have a stabilizing effect upon the market. The U. S. Grain Growers, Inc. in a statement made public December 22, says that it has 90,000,000 bushels of grain signed up to be marketed through its agencies each year during the next five years.

One fact which is hopeful for the future of coöperation is the growing interest in coöperative finance. It has always seemed to me significant that in Germany the coöperative credit society preceded coöperative marketing. Am I exaggerating the importance of finance

when I say that it is the heart of marketing? The last annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation instructed President Howard to appoint a committee to give special study during the coming year to agricultural finance. We seem to be agreed on the need for an intermediate credit as pointed out by Dr. Holdsworth yesterday. I am inclined to believe also, as he suggested and as recommended by others previously, that the Federal Farm Loan System might well be adapted to handle this new form of credit. I have always been impressed with the coöperative feature of the Federal Farm Loan System. It has seemed to me that the local unit, namely, the National Farm Loan Association, might prove to be the training school for coöperation by farmers. At present I see no good reason why it should not develop into an important local banking institution supplying coöperatively a considerable portion of the funds for the commercial as well as the investment needs of farmers.

May I suggest that we need to know more about coöperation in the United States? As Professor Nourse said, we have some valuable quantitative data supplied by the U. S. Bureau of Markets and the Census Bureau. In addition, we should know how well the coöperative marketing association is performing the marketing functions. The American Farm Bureau Federation has undertaken a survey to try to throw more light on this subject. We will need the help of every man here, and you will no doubt hear from us soon asking your judgment about certain matters and in some cases requesting even more assistance than your advice. May we bespeak your cordial coöperation?

I want to say finally that the American Farm Bureau Federation appreciates this opportunity to appear on the program of your association. We believe that the U. S. Bureau of Markets, the state market bureaus, and the colleges of agriculture, represented largely by you men here, are doing the fundamental work which will insure the future success of coöperation.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION.

DR. HENRY C. TAYLOR,

CHIEF, BUREAU OF MARKETS AND CROP ESTIMATES.

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE.

So far as I know the first meeting in the United States relating to agricultural economics was held in connection with the 9th annual meeting of the American Economic Association, at Johns Hopkins University, in 1897, the report of which was published by the American Economic Association.¹

This meeting consisted of the discussion of seven economic questions propounded by L. H. Bailey of Cornell University; W. A. Scott, University of Wisconsin; C. S. Walker, Lester F. Ward, John F. Crowell, R. E. A. Seligman, M. W. Folwell, Walter F. Wilcox, E. R. Johnson, Thomas G. Sherman, and E. D. Peters. The general title was put in the form of "Is there a distinct agricultural question?", but most of the discussion centered about problems of land tenure, mortgage indebtedness and credit, and the movement of population from country to city. While the questions stated by Professor Bailey, if followed out in detail, would have brought up questions of farm management, the interest of those participating in the discussion did not lead them to give any particular attention either to the economics of farm management or to the economics of marketing.

It is interesting to find the phrase, "maladjustment of agriculture to other industries," which is the one we have heard so much of in recent months, and to find Professor Johnson saying: "It is not national but international in its scope and it is to be settled only with reference to other nations."

It appears that the next important public meeting relating to economics and farm management was at St. Louis, December, 1903. This was a joint session between Section I of the Association for the Advancement of Science and the Society for the Promotion of Agricultural Science. The papers relating to agricultural economics were as follows: "Fundamentals of Forestry of the New Agriculture" by

¹ Economic Studies, American Economic Association, vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 52-67.

Thomas H. Sherrard; "Improvement in Farm Management" by W. M. Hays; "Economic Functions of Live Stock" by Charles F. Curtiss; "Agricultural Economics" by Henry C. Taylor; "Evolution of Agriculture in the Middle West and Its Social and Economic Significance" by Eugene Davenport. This program is of interest in the study of the history of the American Farm Economic Association, because it indicates that those connected with the early beginnings of farm management and of agricultural economics were meeting together along with deans of agriculture as early as 1903. W. M. Hays, as Professor in the University of Minnesota, was the first to begin agricultural cost accounting in this country and, later, as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, was responsible for beginning cost of production studies in the Federal Department of Agriculture.

The next meeting that may be said to have a relation to the genesis of the Farm Economic Association was a Round Table in Agricultural Economics held as a part of the 20th annual meeting of the American Economic Association, December, 1907. This meeting was held in the library of the State Historical Society, at Madison, Wisconsin, and Professor T. N. Carver was chairman of the meeting. In his opening remarks he states: "This is the first Round Table on Agricultural Economics, in fact, the first time the subject of agricultural economics has been recognized by the American Economic Association." The meeting was devoted, largely, to the question of "What is Agricultural Economics?" "What does it include and what place ought it to have in the college course?" It is of interest to note that those present and participating in the discussion included the men interested in the subject from the standpoint of farm management and country life as well as those who had approached the field more largely from the field of economics. Kenyon L. Butterfield, R. P. Teele, F. W. Blackmar, John G. Thompson, W. A. Peck, Edward C. Parker, David Kinley, B. H. Hibbard, H. C. Taylor, W. D. Hoard, and John N. Glenn participated. The Proceedings were published by the American Economic Association in 1908.²

The next year the American Economic Association met at Atlantic City, New Jersey, in December, and devoted one section to Economic Geography and Agricultural Economics. Edward Vandyke Robinson read a paper on "Economic Geography" and John Lee Coulter read a paper on "Coöperation in the Marketing of Agricultural Products", after which the subject of Agricultural Economics was discussed by J. B. Morman and T. N. Carver. While the marketing

² American Economic Association, Proceedings, 3d series, vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 59-82.

question received more attention on this occasion than at previous meetings, the farm-management phase of the subject was practically ignored. The proceedings of this meeting are found in the Quarterly of the American Economic Association.³

Independent development of work in farm economics was begun by the teachers of farm management. Dr. G. F. Warren called a meeting of the teachers of farm management in conjunction with the Graduate School of Agriculture at Cornell University in July, 1908. At the Graduate School of Agriculture at Ames in 1910 Dr. Spillman gave a special series of lectures on farm management and plans were laid for the organization of the American Farm Management Association. It was organized on July 27 during the last week of the graduate school. The purposes of the association as indicated by the constitution were:

1. To promote the investigation and teaching of farm management.
2. To consider lines of investigation best adapted to the needs of the work of farm management and to suggest to various investigators plans of correlation and coöperation in the work.
3. To investigate the methods of lecture and laboratory work in farm management and to make suggestions to the members of the Association and to colleges intending to organize courses in farm management.
4. To hold annual meetings at times and places designated by the executive committee.

The following men participated in the organization: G. N. Lauman, elected chairman of the meeting; C. W. Pugsley, E. H. Webster, M. E. McCulloch, W. J. Spillman, D. H. Otis, H. Hayward, B. H. Hibbard, G. F. Warren, J. A. Foord, Frank D. Gardner, K. L. Butterfield, Andrew Boss, L. H. Goddard, Leroy Anderson, D. H. Doane, and E. H. Thomson. This association had a very rapid growth and held meetings annually, reports of which were published every year.⁴ Membership grew steadily. Its further history is traced later in this paper, in chronological order.

In December, 1910, a group of men interested in Agricultural Economics met with the American Economic Association and the American Statistical Association at St. Louis and held a special ses-

³ American Economic Association Quarterly, vol. x, No. 1, pp. 247-274.

⁴ American Farm Management Association. Report of Annual Meeting. 1st-3d. 1910-1913.

American Farm Management Association. Record of the Proceedings of Annual Meeting. 4th-8th. 1914-1918.

sion, in which Legrand Powers, H. C. Taylor, B. H. Hibbard, J. L. Coulter, J. G. Thompson, E. V. Robinson, and T. N. Carver participated. The proceedings of this meeting were published by the American Statistical Association.⁵

The American Farm Management Association proved to fill an important place and usually held its meeting in conjunction with the meeting of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations. A statement of analysis of rural problems prepared for the American Farm Management Association by Kenyon L. Butterfield separated definitely the fields of Farm Management and Agricultural Economics. This analysis was not acceptable to all the people interested in the field and, as a result, a special committee of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations was appointed, with Dean T. F. Hunt as chairman, to report upon the relation of, and the place of, agricultural economics and farm management in the courses of study in agricultural colleges.

The Farm Management Association met with the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations at Columbus, Ohio, in November, 1911, and had a joint session on agricultural economics and farm management. Discussions were developed in which each one indicated the field as he saw it. The report of the committee, which pointed toward the ultimate combination and correlation of the work in farm management with the work in agricultural economics, is found in the Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations.⁶

The American Economic Association provided for a Round Table on farm management at its meeting in Boston, December, 1912. Henry C. Taylor was chairman of the Round Table and the discussion was participated in by T. N. Carver; C. K. Graham of the Hampton Institute; J. A. Valentine, then a farmer near Boston and specialist in farm accounting; Richard Hittinger, a market gardener near Boston; W. H. Bowker, well known in the agricultural chemical industry; Wilbur O. Hedrick, Professor of Economics in the Michigan Agricultural College. The proceedings of this Round Table are to be found in the Supplement of the *American Economic Review*.⁷

From 1913 to 1916 the American Farm Management Association and the National Conference on Marketing and Farm Credits, which

⁵ American Statistical Association, Quarterly Publications, vol. 12, pp. 460-489.

⁶ Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, Proceedings 25th annual meeting, pp. 18-33.

⁷ American Economic Review Supplement, vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 96-113.

met annually at Chicago, were the principal organizations in the United States for the discussion of questions relating to agricultural economics. The National Conference on Marketing and Farm Credits, together with the Commissions National and State, led in the development of economic legislation and had an important relation to the development of the Federal Farm Loan System and the marketing activities of the United States Department of Agriculture. In the later meetings of the Conference, problems of land tenure were included in the program of the Conference. In this way the Conference gradually came to include the whole field of Agricultural Economics other than farm management.

The National Association of Agricultural Economics grew out of the Conference on Markets and Credits and had its inception in a group of about thirty agricultural economists and state marketing officials who met in Chicago in 1915. These men felt the need of an organization that would unite their interests and give them an opportunity to discuss various economic problems in a somewhat more scientific way than was being done at the National Conference. A committee was appointed to arrange a meeting in 1916 to decide on a plan for organization. The committee appointed consisted of Paul Vogt, W. O. Hedrick, and J. L. Coulter.

The group met again in Chicago in 1916 with the National Conference, and presented a program, received the report of the organization committee, and voted to organize the Association of Agricultural Economics. They adopted a tentative constitution and made plans to solicit membership from among the various groups of economists present at the National Conference. Alexander E. Cance was chosen President and W. O. Hedrick Secretary and Treasurer. About forty members were reported. The purposes of the organization were as follows:

1. To unite the interests of agricultural economists.
2. To promote the study of various phases of agricultural economics; to encourage research and the discussion of problems and subjects pertaining to the theory or practical application of the principles of agricultural economics.
3. To disseminate information relating to the subject of agricultural economics.
4. To collect and disseminate information concerning agrarian legislation; and to analyze, digest, and classify agricultural laws in their economic application.
5. To hold an annual meeting at some place to be designated by the members of the executive committee.

During the year the membership was increased and included instructors in agricultural economics, extension service men in marketing, investigators of economic problems in agriculture, state and national marketing officials, and in general men who were interested in agricultural economics, either from a practical or an academic standpoint. A great deal of interest was manifested in the new organization.

During the year 1917 the National Association of State Marketing Officials decided not to hold a meeting in December. The National Conference also decided that its work was completed. In consequence, a movement was inaugurated, and it gained considerable ground, to unite the National Association of Marketing Officials and the Agricultural Economists as soon as a meeting could be conveniently arranged. Meantime, some twenty members of the Marketing Officials united with the Association for Agricultural Economists.

The National Association of Agricultural Economists met at Philadelphia in December with the American Economic Association. About thirty members were present and practically all of them were academic economists. At that time the organization had about seventy-five members, and a prospective membership list sufficient to bring the number up to about one hundred.

The American Farm Management Association also met with the American Economic Association in December, 1917, and it was at this time that the proposal to consolidate the two associations was first brought forward. While many in both associations favored the consolidation, it was decided that a committee of three should be appointed from each of the associations for the purpose of considering the matter and reporting at the next meeting.

Meantime, two other movements were in process. Several members of the American Economic Association felt that a new organization with a broad program was less desirable than one with a much narrower scope and affiliated with the American Economic Association, similar to the Association for Labor Legislation. Another movement was the enlargement of the scope and purposes of the Farm Management Association to include all questions of economics, to change the name to the American Farm Economics Association, and to affiliate the Association of Agricultural Economists and the Farm Management Association.

The Association for Agricultural Legislation was approved by most of the academic agricultural economists, although there were

some who felt that the scope of the organization was too narrow and did not allow for the inclusion of a great number of practical economists working on other problems or who were very doubtful as to financial support of such an organization. Sufficient assurances of financial support were given to win over the doubters and the ill-starred Association for Agricultural Legislation was launched by a group of members of the American Economic Association in December, 1917.

The American Farm Management Association voted to appoint a committee of three to meet with a similar committee from the National Association of Agricultural Economists to consider a basis of affiliation. The joint committee agreed upon consolidation under the title of American Farm Economics Association and reported this conclusion to their associations. The American Farm Management Association voted in January, 1919, to change its name to the American Farm Economic Association and to change its constitution so as to broaden the scope of work to include that formerly covered by the National Association of Agricultural Economists. Pursuant to the agreement in the joint committee, the Association of Agricultural Economists abandoned their organization and joined the American Farm Economic Association. This seemed the practical way to bring about the consolidation, as the Farm Management Association was more completely organized and had a very much larger membership. By this date the membership had reached 350. Prior to this time, as the Farm Management Association, this organization had had no relationships with any other economic association, but had gradually broadened its field until it covered substantially all phases of farm economics except marketing.

Since the change of name and the absorption of the National Association of Agricultural Economists, this Association, under the new name, has been in closer association with the economists of the country and has frequently met at the same time as the American Economic Association.

At the Baltimore meeting in January, 1919, the American Farm Economic Association voted to begin the publication of a quarterly journal and the first number appeared under the date of June, 1919.⁸

The marketing officials who had been affiliated with the National Association of Agricultural Economists, feeling that they had special interests that bound them together, formed an organization of state marketing officials which gives especial attention to the administra-

⁸ JOURNAL OF FARM ECONOMICS, vol. 1, No. 1, June, 1919.

tion of State and Federal marketing activities. This organization is not a general organization. Only state marketing officials can be active members, although others may be associate members. It is a society of officials and as such has important work to do.

The American Farm Economic Association is rendering valuable service in stimulating thought and in helping to solve the economic problems of the American farmer. The membership at the present time is approximately seven hundred. It is the only comprehensive organization of agricultural economists in the United States covering the fields of farm management, marketing, land economics and agricultural credit.

REMARKS BY W. J. SPILLMAN.

My connection with the development of farm management and rural economics came about in this way. On July 1, 1894, I went to Pullman, Washington, as Professor of Agriculture and agriculturist to the State Experiment Station. The country was new to me and very different from anything I had ever seen. I planned an elaborate list of experiments with a view to finding out as much as I could about the agriculture of the State. Later I had the opportunity to travel widely over the State in connection with the Farmers' Institutes, which gave me an opportunity to learn that the more progressive farmers of the State already knew at least half of what I was trying to find out. I was so much impressed with the vast amount of knowledge the better class of farmers had that in January, 1902, when I came to the National Department of Agriculture and found myself at liberty to plan my own work, I chose to begin the deliberate study of farm practice, with a view to getting together and analyzing the knowledge farmers had already gained in their experience.

It was only a short while until it was perceived that there was a great unexplored field of such knowledge, and that there was a science of farm management hidden in this field. I came here as head of the Office of Grass and Forage Plant Investigations, but by July 1, 1905, the character of the work of that office had become well differentiated from ordinary agronomic work and the name of the office was changed to Farm Management and my title was changed from Agrostologist to Agriculturist. It is only fair to state that Professor W. A. Hayes, then of the Minnesota Agricultural College and later Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, was responsible for the term "Farm Management" which we adopted for the name of the new science. Dr. H. C. Taylor had used this term in an essay as early as 1893, but that fact was not then known to us here.

In addition to the work which was being done in Minnesota, Cornell University developed a strong course in farm management and coöperated very fully and freely with us here at Washington, to our great advantage. Professor Warren deliberately trained his students for the examinations in our office, a fact which accounts for the large proportion of Cornell men in the old office of Farm Management. Meanwhile our present chief, who was then at the University of Wisconsin, was working along much the same lines, and we finally came in contact and found that our work was sufficiently similar to make coöperation advantageous, and thereafter we coöperated extensively with Dr. Taylor and his people at Madison. Other institutions gradually took up work along these lines and interest in them is now universal.

The exact content of the entire field is not yet outlined in minute detail and there is perhaps some little confusion as to the distinction between farm management and other branches of the general subject of rural economics. I have recently made an outline of the entire subject, as I understand it, which I hope will clear up this difficulty. I may say that I was stimulated to do this by a suggestion from Dr. Taylor. The general subjects which constitute what I have always called Farm Management may be comprehended under four headings. They are:

1. Distinctions between farming and other businesses.
2. The factors of success in farming, such as:—size of business, yield per acre, production per animal, economy in the use of labor and power, and economy in equipment.
3. Farm organization: financial, physical, and business.
4. Farm records.

The next subdivision of the general subject is Marketing. Then follow subjects of a more general character, such as:—prices and the forces that control them, the use of credit in farming, rural insurance, tenancy, and rural life problems.

I think it is a fortunate thing that all these branches of investigation have been brought together in one organization, for this will make possible the intimate coöperation which is necessary for the full development of all of them.

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF AMERICAN FARM ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION AS OF APRIL 1, 1922.

State representatives of the organization are indicated by an asterisk.

- Aamodt, A. W., 223 4th Ave. S. W., Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 *Abell, M. F., Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
 Abney, Bertram, Mt. Vernon, Ill.
 Adams, A. E., Ellendale, N. Dak.
 Adams, Charles S., Farm Bureau, Reading, Pa.
 Adams, Harvey S., 505 Federal St., Butler, Pa.
 *Adams, R. L., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Albrecht, Arthur E., College City of New York.
 Allbaugh, L. G., 117 E. Ninth St., Ames, Iowa.
 Allen, F. L., 333 W. 8th Ave., Columbus, Ohio.
 Allison, H. O., Pontiac, Ill.
 *Allred, C. E., College of Agriculture, Knoxville, Tenn.
 American Farm Bureau, 1411 Pa. Ave., Washington, D. C.
 Anderson, C. Claude, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Anderson, E. W., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
 Andrews, J. B., Brookwater Farm, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 App, Frank, Agricultural College, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Aquino, E. G., 112 S. Warren St., Madison, Wis.
 Armour and Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Arnold, C. R., Agricultural College, Columbus, Ohio.
 Ashby, A. W., Coldstones, Ascott-under-Wychwood, Oxon, England.
 Assistant Livestock Commissioner, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
 Ault, A. C., George Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.
 Austin, Wm. L., Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C.
 Ayrs, O. L., 1001 Crescent Ave., Birmingham, Ala.
 Babson Statistical Organization, Wellesley Hills, Mass.
 Bader, E. H., Hesperus, Colo.
 Bailey, L. H., Ithaca, N. Y.
 Baker, Murray M., Peoria, Ill.
 Baker, O. E., Chevy Chase, Md.
 Bakke, H. Noel, College Station, Pullman, Wash.
 Ball, J. S., McLean, Va.
 Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, Milwaukee, Wis.

- Barkas, Benj. W., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Barker, M. M., Holt Manufacturing Company, Peoria, Ill.
Barr, J. E., 213 14th St. S. E., Washington, D. C.
Barrett, Frank N., Pittsfield, Ill.
Barrett, Joe C., 1736 G St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Barton, H., McDonald College, Quebec, Canada.
Bass, Fred, Armstrong, Ill.
Bassett, L. B., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
Baumeister, G. F., Freeport, Ill.
Bayard, E. S., National Stockman Farmer, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Baysinger, Walter J. G., Arcola, Ill.
Beardsley, Henry S., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Becker, J. A., Box 354, Madison, Wis.
Beeson, M. A., College of Agriculture, Stillwater, Okla.
*Benedict, M. R., Brookings, S. Dak.
Benner, Claude L., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Benton, A. H., Manitoba Agricultural College, Winnipeg, Canada.
Besley, H. J., 1105 K St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Bidwell, P. W., 1650 Monroe St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Billings, G. A., Box 243, Morristown, N. J.
Bilsborrow, J. D., 1210 Springfield Ave., Urbana, Ill.
Bizzell, W. B., College Station, Tex.
Black, J. D., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
Bliss, J. A., Mount Ayr, Iowa.
Boeger, E. A., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Bohannon, Chas. D., Bureau of Markets, Washington, D. C.
Bollinger, W. L., Farm Bureau, Pottsville, Pa.
Bonham, E. R., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Borden, Wm. H., care of Platteville Normal School, Platteville, Wis.
Borum, C. J., West Point, Ind.
Boss, Andrew, University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
Bouton, C. S., 344 State House, Little Rock, Ark.
Boyle, James E., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Bracher, E. M. D., Galesburg, Ill.
Bradlee, Thomas, College of Agriculture, Burlington, Vt.
Brannen, C. O., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Brigham, E. S., St. Albans, Vt.
Brodell, Albert, Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Bronson, W. H., New England Milk Producers Association, 51
Cornhill, Boston, Mass.
Brookens, P. F., 10 N. Wells Ave., Hyattsville, Md.

- *Brossard, E. B., Farm Management Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.
- Brown, E. E., Toulon, Ill.
- Brown, E. A., Sparks, Md.
- Brown, B. F., Division of Markets, Raleigh, N. C.
- Brown, Pembroke H., 310 Commerce Building, Urbana, Ill.
- Brunskill, H. C., Medina, Ohio.
- Bryant, Geo. C., 102 N. Senate Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Buck, J. Lossing, Naking, Ku, China.
- Buechel, F. A., College Station, Tex.
- Burk, L. B., Bureau of Markets, Washington, D. C.
- Burdick, R. T., Department of Agriculture, Ft. Collins, Colo.
- Burmeister, C. A., Bureau of Markets, Washington, D. C.
- Burns, C. C., Elizabeth, Ill.
- Burr, Walter, Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kans.
- Burritt, M. C., College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Butler, Dr. Tait, P. O. Box 935, Memphis, Tenn.
- Butterworth, George, East Falls Church, Va.
- Cady, Elvyn, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
- Cairns, J. H., LaSalle, Ill.
- Caldwell, C. C., Elks' Building, Dayton, Ohio.
- California Joint Stock Land Bank, San Francisco, Calif.
- Callander, W. F., Bureau of Markets, Washington, D. C.
- Camburn, H. H., Chadron, Neb.
- Callaghan, F. R., Education Board, Shortland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Camp, William R., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
- Card, Dana G., College of Agriculture, Lexington, Ky.
- Card, Leslie E., Poultry Department, New York State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Carpenter, Charles G., R. F. D. No. 2, Chevy Chase, Md.
- Carver, T. N., 7 Kirkland Road, Cambridge, Mass.
- Case, H. C. M., 433 W. Gilman St., Madison, Wis.
- Catherwood, B. F., Dayton, Ind.
- *Cavert, W. L., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
- Chalcraft, Valmeyer, Ill.
- Chapin, R. W., 327 S. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
- Cheatham, Mrs. Bessie S., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
- Chessman, James B., 892 Kensington Road, Los Angeles, Calif.

- Clark, Alexis L., Bureau of Markets, Trenton, N. J.
Clark, Chas. P., Skaneateles, N. Y.
Clark, H. W., Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.
Clement, F. M., University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B. C.
Clinebell, H. J., 429 S. Grand Ave., Springfield, Ill.
Clothier, R. W., College of Agriculture, State College, N. Mex.
Cobb, O. C., Anna, Ill.
Coddington, W. F., Onawa, Iowa.
Codlin, H. E., Dallas Center, Iowa.
Coke, J., Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Canada.
Collier, G. A., Arlington, Va.
Combs, Robert, Manchester, Iowa.
Cooper, M. R., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Cooper, T. P., College of Agriculture, Lexington, Ky.
Cotton, J. S., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Coupe, J. F., 410 Observatory Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
*Cox, A. B., Texas Experiment Station, College Station, Tex.
Crawford Co. Farm Bureau, Robinson, Ill.
Crickman, C. W., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Cromwell, A. D., State Normal School, West Chester, Pa.
Cross, R. W., Ottawa, Ill.
*Currier, E. L., Agricultural College, Bozeman, Mont.
Cutler, J. E., Western Reserve College, Cleveland, Ohio.
- *Dadisman, A. J., College of Agriculture, Morgantown, W. Va.
Dagger, G. N., Bureau of Markets, Washington, D. C.
Darter Bros. & Co., Box 174, Stellenbosch, South Africa.
Davidson, A. E., Mount Sterling, Ill.
*Davis, Irving G., College of Agriculture, Storrs, Conn.
Davis, L. V., 340 S. Lumpkins St., Athens, Ga.
Davis, S., Ft. Pierre, S. Dak.
Davis, W. C., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Day, E. D., Cobbleskill, N. Y.
De Loach, R. J. H., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Deneen, Charles S., 29 S. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
De Vault, S. H., 737 11th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Dickinson, W. A., Charles City, Iowa.
Dinsmore, Wayne, 9318 Longwood Drive, Chicago, Ill.
*Dixon, H. M., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

- Doane, D. Howard, Poplar Bluff, Mo.
Dodge, L. G., West Newbury, Mass.
Doble, Wm. E., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Doerschuk, J. J., Anna, Ill.
Doherty, T. K., International Institute of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.
Dooley, H. A., Old Court House, Cleveland, Ohio.
Donald, J. S., College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
Doneghue, R. C., Macomb, Ill.
Dorsey, Henry, Agricultural College, Storrs, Conn.
Douglas, A. W., Simmons Headquarters Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Dowler, John, Xenia, Ohio.
Drake, J. A., Farm Stock and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.
Duckwall, Ruth M., Department of Farm Management, Lexington, Ky.
Durst, C. E., Arlington Heights, Ill.
- Eade, Ben C., Sandwich, Ill.
- *Eastman, M. Gale, New Hampshire College, Durham, N. H.
Eckhardt, W. G., Illinois Agricultural Association, Chicago, Ill.
Edinger, Paul L., 18 S. Hanover St., Carlisle, Pa.
Edson, Allen W., Morris, Minn.
Edler, G. C., 1137 Allison St., Washington, D. C.
Edwards, Harold, 125 Hargrave St., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
*Eliot, H. M., Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
Elliott, F. E., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Elliott, F. F., 1210 Springfield St., Urbana, Ill.
Elsworth, R. H., 1924 Lawrence St. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Ely, Richard T., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Enerson, A. E., Pipestone, Minn.
Engberg, R. C., University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
*Englund, Eric, Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kans.
- Erdman, H. E., Bureau of Markets, Washington, D. C.
Englebert, E. E., 1736 G St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Estabrook, Leon M., 1026 17th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Evans, Morris, 1601 Poyntz Ave., Manhattan, Kans.
Evans, Raymond, Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Evans, R. J., Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.
Evans, Wm. L., 6402 Georgia Ave. N. W., Washington, D. C.

Ewing, Chas. A., National Bank Building, Decatur, Ill.

Ewing, E. C., Scott, Miss.

Ezekiel, Mordecai, Locust Grove Farm, Berwyn, Md.

Fahrnkopf, Harrison F. T., Bloomington, Ill.

Fain, J. R., College of Agriculture, Athens, Ga.

*Falconer, J. I., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Farrell, F. D., Agricultural Experiment Station, Manhattan, Kans.

Federal Board for Vocational Education, Library, Maltby Building,
Washington, D. C.

Feldkamp, Cora L., Box 661, East Lansing, Mich.

Fessenden, S. D., Taylor Building, Wakefield, Mass.

Filley, H. C., University Farm, Lincoln, Nebr.

Fish, Don E., Mt. Pleasant, Iowa.

Fisher, F. A., Wabash County Farm Bureau, Mt. Carmel, Ill.

Fisher, Walter, Canton, N. Y.

Fitts, Harrison F., 819 Webster St. N. W., Washington, D. C.

Five, Haakon, Norwegian Legation, The Wyoming Apartments,
Washington, D. C.

Fleming, S. T., Experiment Station Building, Gainesville, Fla.

Flohr, Lewis B., Lock Box 27, Vienna, Va.

Folsom, Josiah C., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

Foord, J. A., College of Agriculture, Amherst, Mass.

Foote, Lorenzo S., Carthage, Ill.

Forster, G. W., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

Fox, D. S., Box 135, Altadena, Calif.

Fraser, W. J., College of Agriculture, Urbana, Ill.

Fremont Joint Stock Land Bank, Fremont, Nebr.

Fry, H. L., Agricultural and Mechanical School, Clarksville, Ga.

Fuller, F. E., Henry, Ill.

Funk, W. C., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

Gabbert, W. R., University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Gabriel, H. S., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Gage, Chas., Falls Church, Va.

Gagne, Charles, École d'Agr. St. Anne de la 'Pocatiere, Quebec,
Canada.

Galloway, J. C., Extension Department, Ames, Iowa.

Galpin, C. J., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

*Gardner, F. D., State College, Pa.

Garey, L. F., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.

- Garrett, E. L., Box 176, Coldwater, Kans.
Garrett, F. W., Tuscola, Ill.
Gatlin, Geo. O., 127 4th St. S. E., Washington, D. C.
Gee, Wilson, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
Geismar, L. M., 145 Diamond St., Houghton, Mich.
Geldenhuys, F. E., 264 Bloomfontein, South Africa.
General Motor Corporation, Sales Service Department, General
Motor Building, Detroit, Mich.
Génung, A. B., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Gernert, W. B., Paris, Ill.
Gibbons, C. E., 2729 Willard Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Gibbons, C. E., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washing-
ton, D. C.
Gilbert, John C., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washing-
ton, D. C.
Gillett, Roy L., College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Gittings, C. C., 1307 Main St., Racine, Wis.
Glasspoole, J. E., Huron, S. Dak.
Goodrich, C. L., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Goodwin, W. Irving, 40 Sycamore Ave., Takoma Park, Md.
Grantham, A. E., Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co., Richmond, Va.
Graff, E. F., 410 Observatory Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
Gray, F. N., 1410 Hawthorne Ave., Houston, Tex.
Gray, L. C., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Great Western Sugar Co., care of H. Mendelson, Sugar Building,
Denver, Colo.
Greene, R. M., Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kans.
Greenewald, A. H., Jr., 819 W. Boston Ave., Monmouth, Ill.
Greene, H. T., Genesee, Wis.
George, James B., Lawrenceville, Ill.
Gregory, C. V., 223 Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
Gries, Miss Caroline G., 1712 Kilbourne Place N. W., Washington,
D. C.
Griffin, F. L., Bud Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Griffith, L. S., Amboy, Ill.
Grimes, W. E., College of Agriculture, Manhattan, Kans.
*Gunn, R. V., State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore.
Gulick, Frank H., Extension Service, Manhattan, Kans.
Gustanson, E. L., Vernon, Utah.

- Haffard, H. R., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Hagan, R. M., 2542 Buena Vista Way, Berkeley, Calif.
Hall, J. Robt., Linneus, Mo.
Hammans, C. W., Iowa State Agricultural College, Ames, Iowa.
Hammatt, Theo. D., Topeka, Kans.
*Handschin, W. F., College of Agriculture, Urbana, Ill.
Hankinson, J. H., Glen Moore, N. J.
Hare, B. B., United States Department of Agriculture, Saluda, S. C.
Harmon, T. D., Jr., 110 Penn. and Shady Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Harris, F. S., Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
Harrison, L. M., Box 833, Phoenix, Ariz.
Hart, Van B., Department of Farm Management, Ithaca, N. Y.
Harter, Wm. L., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Hartman, S. C., Marietta, Ohio.
Haskell, E. S., 1832 16th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Hauter, L. H., State College, New Mexico.
Hauver, P. A., Frederick, Md.
Haverstick, H. H., Farm Bureau, Franklin, Pa.
Hawley, Miss C. R., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Hawthorne, H. W., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Hecler, W. R., Dalton, Mo.
Hedgcock, W. E., Peoria County Farm Bureau, Peoria, Ill.
Hedgcock, J. F., Joliet, Ill.
Henderson, Miss Bertha, Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Hennis, C. M., Gainesville, N. Y.
Hibbard, B. H., Agricultural College, Madison, Wis.
Higbie, E. C., Madison, S. Dak.
Hill, E. B., Box 911, East Lansing, Mich.
Hite, J. E., Sylvester, Ga.
Hoag, Emily F., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Hobson, Asher, School of Business, Columbia University, New York City.
Hodges, J. A., 121 Bassett Court, Lexington, Ky.
Holman, H. K., Jr., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Holmes, C. L., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Holmes, Geo. K., 1323 Irving St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Hopkins, John A., Jr., Newark, Del.
Hopkins, John A., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Horn, P. V., 315 Elmwood Ave., Ithaca, N. Y.

- Horlick, A. J., Racine, Wis.
 Horlick, Wm., Jr., Racine, Wis.
 Horner, J. T., Columbia University, New York City.
 Howe, F. W., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Hughes, C. A., Petersburg, Ill.
 Hulbert, L. S., 501 Ethelhurst Apartments, Washington, D. C.
 Humboldt County Farm Bureau, Humboldt, Iowa.
 *Hungerford, De Forest, College of Agriculture, Athens, Ga.
 *Hunter, Byron, College of Agriculture, Moscow, Idaho.
 Hunton, Guy, First Joint Stock Land Bank, 208 LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
 *Hutcheson, T. B., Blacksburg, Va.
 Hutson, J. B., College of Agriculture, Lexington, Ky.

 Irwin, H. S., College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.

 Jackson, H. D., County Agent, Rockport, Ind.
 Jacobs, Daniel C., R. D. No. 5, Gettysburg, Pa.
 Jamison, Neal C., Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore.
 Janes, Lionel L., 339 Postoffice Building, New Orleans, La.
 Jeffers, H. W., Walker-Gordon Farms, Plainsboro, N. J.
 Jenkins, Chas. F., care of Farm Journal, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Jenkins, W. B., 1315 Belmont St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Jenney, B. G., Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.
 Jennings, R. D., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
 Jensen, W. C., Clemson College, S. C.
 Jerdan, A. L., Division of Extension, Knoxville, Tenn.
 Jett, C. U., 235 South Limestone St., Lexington, Ky.
 Jesness, O. B., University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
 Johnson, E. C., College of Agriculture, Pullman, Wash.
 Johnson, Ernest R., Box 201, College Station, Pullman, Wash.
 Johnson, H. W., 1819 F St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Johnson, O. M., 1775 Bedford Rd., Upper Arlington, Columbus, Ohio.
 *Johnson, O. R., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Johnson, R. E., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
 Johnson, T. C., Virginia Truck Experiment Station, Norfolk, Va.
 Jones, Jesse M., Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Norfolk, Va.
 Jones, Myrtle E., 820 W. Johnson St., Madison, Wis.
 Jordan, Edna M., The Victoria, Washington, D. C.

Jordbrukstekniska Byrån, Vastra Hamngatan, 20 Gateberg, Sweden.

Justin, M. M., 442 State Capitol, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Juve, O. A., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

Kell, W. V., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Keller, E. R., Bowling Green, Mo.

Keller, Henry, Jr., College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.

Kelley, Geo. W., 600 Oneida St., Minneapolis, Minn.

Kelly, F. B., Box 764, Kimball, Nebr.

Kent, H. L., Agricultural College, State College, N. Mex.

Kern, F. L., Marian, Ind.

Keltner, C. H., Rockford, Ill.

Kendall, George B., Jacksonville, Ill.

Kezer, Alvin, College of Agriculture, Fort Collins, Colo.

Kimmel, L., Galconda, Ill.

Kirkpatrick, E. L., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Klapp, C. W., Court House, Easton, Pa.

Klemmondson, G. S., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.

Krauss, F. G., University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Kurtz, Wm. J., 317 N. Warren St., Madison, Wis.

Lacy, Mary G., 1434 Harvard St., Washington, D. C.

Ladd, C. E., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Lafayette Loan & Trust Company, Lafayette, Ind.

Lampson, Lee M., 610 Empire Building, Spokane, Wash.

Lamson, J. B., 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

Leitch, A., Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Canada.

Lescohier, D. D., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Leonard, Howard, Eureka, Ill.

Lichtenwallner, Milton H., 51 S. 11th St., Reading, Pa.

Linfield, F. B., College of Agriculture, Bozeman, Mont.

Lippitt, W. D., Great Western Sugar Company, Denver, Colo.

*Lipscomb, J. N., Agricultural College, Mississippi.

Livingston, Geo., 305 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.

Livermore, J. C., Quaker Hill Farm, Honeoye Falls, N. Y.

*Lloyd, O. G., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Lockwood, A. F., Chateaugay, N. Y.

Longley, W. V., Hallock, Minn.

Longmire, F. E., Morris, Ill.

Loveland, E. H., Burlington, Vt.

Loomis, Ralph, Room 210, Agricultural Building, Columbia, Mo.
Lyons, Roy J., Greenup, Ill.
Lucas, F. L., Kittridge Building, Denver, Colo.
Luedtke, C. L., The Hadleigh, Washington, D. C.

- *Macklin, Theodore, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
Madden, I. A., Springfield, Ill.
Manchester, Allen W., Agricultural College, Storrs, Conn.
Martin, Wm. L., 1203 Hackney St., Winfield, Kans.
Marquis, J. Clyde, 1822 Lamont St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Mayland, Edwin, Devil's Lake, N. Dak.
Mead, Elwood, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Meeker, Dr. Royal, International Labor Office, League of Nations,
Geneva, Switzerland.
Medlar, Arthur W., 523 W. 6 University Place, Lincoln, Nebr.
Meharry, Charles L., Attica, Ind.
Melvin, J. C., 389 S. Upper St., Lexington, Ky.
Meek, J. H., 313 Lyric Building, Richmond, Va.
Mendenhall, D. W., Glendive, Mont.
Mendum, Samuel W., 1826 G St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Metzger, G. E., Carlinville, Ill.
Miles, Ward R., Great Bend, Kans.
Miller, Cap R., 1125 11th Ave., N. Fargo, N. Dak.
Miller, E. E., 1523 Broad St., Nashville, Tenn.
Miller, R. N., State College, Pullman, Wash.
Mills, Strycher H., 311 Dryden Road, Ithaca, N. Y.
Misner, E. G., College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Mitchell, W. C., 514 S. William St., Columbia, Mo.
Mohler, R. E., McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.
Mohler, J. C., Secretary of Agriculture, Topeka, Kans.
Moffitt, Earl L., 200 W. College Ave., State College, Pa.
Montgomery, Cary, Agricultural Experiment Station, Wooster,
Ohio.
Montgomery, Frank, Berea College, Berea, Ky.
Montgomery, John T., Cambridge, Ill.
Moore, Miss Louise, 20 N. Elm St., Clarendon, Va.
Moorhouse, H. A., 611 N. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.
*Moorhouse, L. A., State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
Montcogudo, H., Quinto de los Molinos, Havana, Cuba.
Mordecai, Ezekiel, Locust Grove Farm, Berwyn, Md.
Morgan Ora S., Columbia University, N. Y.
Morse, Stanley E., 82 Wall St., New York City, N. Y.

- Mosher, M. L., Eureka, Ill.
Morison, F. L., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Morris, G. L., 337 Custom House, Nashville, Tenn.
Mumford, H. W., Urbana, Ill.
Mumford, Eben, College of Agriculture, East Lansing, Mich.
Murray, Nat C., 1650 Irving St., Washington, D. C.
Myers, Arthur L., Marion, Kans.
*Myers, W. I., College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
McBride, C. G., 203 Linden Ave., Ithaca, N. Y.
McCord, W. H., Agricultural College, St. Paul, Minn.
McCord, J. E., Rural Life Department, State College, Pa.
McCrory, S. H., 6811 6th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
McDonald, Murl, State College of Agriculture, Ames, Iowa.
McGhee, O. M., Vienna, Ill.
McKee, J. M., Box 8, Middleton, Wis.
McKelvey, Frank H., 1615 S. 6th St., Springfield, Ill.
McKay, A. W., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
McKinley, Bruce, Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
McLean, Donald, Twin Falls, Idaho.
McLean, Edward E., Towson, Md.
*McNair, A. D., College of Agriculture, Fayetteville, Ark.
McNall, P. E., University Club, Madison, Wis.
McWilliams, M., Sparta, Ill.
- Nakashima, Kuro, Imperial University, Sapporo, Japan.
Nason, W. C., 1900 R St., Washington, D. C.
National Fertilizer Co., 236 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
Needu, M. B., Cosmopolitan Club, Ithaca, N. Y.
Newton, L. W., Room 615, 131 State St., Boston, Mass.
Nicholas, R. D., Box 222, McPherson, Kans.
*Nicholls, W. D., College of Agriculture, Lexington, Ky.
Niesley, H. G., 805 N. 6th Sta., Harrisburg, Pa.
Noble, Clarence A., Department of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Nixon, R. L., 112 Carroll Ave., Takoma Park, Md.
Noble, G. L., 75 W. Monroe St., Chicago, Ill.
Norton, F. Lee, Badger Building, Racine, Wis.
Norton, L. J., Farm Management Department, Ithaca, N. Y.
Nourse, E. G., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Nuckols, S. B., P. O. Box 407, Ft. Collins, Colo.

O'Brien, D. A., Court House, Lancaster, N. H.
 Olsen, Nils A., 1810 Ontario Place, Washington, D. C.
 Olson, M. E., Eldorado, Iowa.
 Oplysningskontoret for Landbruk, Christiania, Norway.
 Orwin, C. S., University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, England.
 Osborn, W. C., 71 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 Osler, N. S., Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Otis, D. H., College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
 Overton, M. H., College of Agriculture, Lafayette, Ind.

Palmer, J. E., 503 Kellogg St., Ames, Iowa.
 Parke, H. H., R. R. No. 2, Genoa, Ill.
 Parker, R. C., 360 Worthington St., Springfield, Mass.
 Passonneau, J., 1436 3d St., S., Louisville, Ky.
 Patton, Palmer, 472 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D. C.
 Peabody, G. Eric, 109 Parker Pl., Ithaca, N. Y.
 Pearson, F. A., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Peck, F. W., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
 Peck, Millard, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
 *Pence, M. O., Delaware College, Newark, Del.
 Peterson, A. W., Department of Agriculture, Charlottetown, P. E. I.,
 Canada.
 Peterson, Guy A., 513 S. Warren St., Madison, Wis.
 Peterson, W. M., 701 Kittredge Building, Denver, Colo.
 Phillips, E. M., Carrollton, Ill.
 Pierce, Geo. Gardner, Box 104, Davis, Calif.
 Plank, Ira L., Winfield, Kans.
 Plumb, H. J., 248 Oak St., Colville, Wash.
 Pond, George A., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
 Potts, Roy C., 3106 19th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Price Current Grain Reporter, 327 S. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
 Randall, Frank J., Catlin, Ill.
 *Rankin, J. O., University Farm, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Rasmussen, M. P., 508 S. Union St., Burlington, Vt.
 Rasmussen, Frederick, State Department of Agriculture, Harris-
 burg, Pa.
 Rauchenstein, Emil, 1104 S. Carl Ave., Urbana, Ill.
 Reed, H. J., Agricultural Experiment Station, Lafayette, Ind.
 Reed, W. G., 121 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Reek, W. R., Live Stock Branch, Ottawa, Canada.

- Rehling, Chas. H., Breese, Ill.
Rhoades, E. L., Extension Division, Manhattan, Kans.
Rice, Miss Katharine G., 1929 Calvert St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Rice, Myron A., 107 Court House, Bakersfield, Calif.
Richards, D. J., Sherborn, Mass.
Richards, W. R., 34 McKinley Ave., Geneva, Ill.
Riddell, F. F., East Lansing, Mich.
Riegel, W. E., Tolono, Ill.
Robb, F. G., 1770 Kilbourne Pl., Washington, D. C.
Roberts, T. H., DeKalb, Ill.
Robbins, E. T., Clinton, Ill.
Robertson, Lynn, 408 Harvey St., Lafayette, Ind.
Robotka, Frank, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Rogers, H. B., Erie Railway Company, Waverly, N. Y.
Roper, F. A., 2400 16th St., Washington, D. C.
Ross, H. A., Dairy Department, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Roth, Walter J., 1210 Springfield Ave., Urbana, Ill.
Rouse, W. L., University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Rusk, E. W., Carlinville, Ill.
Ryerson, K. A., Office of Farm Advisor, 361 Court House, Los Angeles, Calif.
- Samson, H. W., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Sanderson, Dwight, State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Sanders, J. T., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Sanders, V. A., Wakefield, Mass.
Sato, Kanji, Chez l'Ambassade du Japan, Paris, France.
Sawtelle, D. W., Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
School District No. 6, Weld County, Greeley, Colo.
Schuster, Geo. L., Newark, Del.
Scoville, G. D., 7 Gracewood Park, Cambridge, Mass.
Scoville, H. T., 302 Commerce Building, Urbana, Ill.
Scoville, Robert, Salisbury, Conn.
Scudder, H. D., State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore.
Secor, Alson, Successful Farming, Des Moines, Iowa.
Selby, H. E., Agricultural Experiment Station, Bozeman, Mont.
Severance, George, State College, Pullman, Wash.
Shaddock, R. E., Mendota, Ill.
Shaffer, James H., Morgantown, W. Va.

- Shaw, Wilfred, 225 S. Maplewood Ave., Peoria, Ill.
Shevy, John, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Shelledy, F. H., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Shepard, John B., College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Sherman, Wells A., R. F. D. No. 3, Vienna, Va.
Sherman, Miss Caroline B., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates,
Washington, D. C.
Simmons, G. E., College of Agriculture, Orono, Me.
Sloane, Mrs. Anne Bogenhohm, Hotel Burlington, Washington,
D. C.
Smith, C. B., States Relations Service, Washington, D. C.
Smith, Edgar L., 98 Chambers St., New York, N. Y.
Smith, Guy C., Commercial Research Department, Swift & Co.,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Smith, J. Russell, Swarthmore, Pa.
Smith, Sidney B., Decatur, Ill.
Smith, W. S. A., Federal Farm Loan Board, Washington, D. C.
Snyder, C. G., Drovers Journal, Chicago, Ill.
Soil Improvement Com., 1101 Lumber Exchange Building, Chicago,
Ill.
Sollenberger, Isaac J., Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
Somers, L. D., Hot Springs, Va.
Sotola, Jerry, College of Agriculture, Pullman, Wash.
Southwick, Benj. G., 308 Church St., Hartford, Conn.
Spafford, R. R., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Spencer, Leland, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Spillman, W. J., Northbrook Courts, Washington, D. C.
Spitler, J. C., Effingham, Ill.
Sprenkle, P. H., Farm Bureau, Doylestown, Pa.
Stacy, W. H., 232 Linden Ave., Ithaca, N. Y.
Steanson, Oscar, 210 N. E. Ninth St., Abilene, Kans.
Stedman, E. Merle, Alascadero, Calif.
Sterrett, W. C., 38 N. 2d St., Clearfield, Pa.
Stewart, C. L., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Stine, O. C., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Stokoe, W. C., Lancaster, N. Y.
Stone, B. C., The Jewish Farmer, 174 Second Ave., N. Y.
Strait, E. D., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Successful Farming, Editorial Department, Des Moines, Iowa.
Summerby, R., McDonald College, Quebec, Canada.
Summers, T. H., 165 Princeton St., Youngstown, Ohio.

- Swanson, H. B., Anamosa, Iowa.
Sweet, Lou D., 934 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
Swinson, Carl R., Office of Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
- Taber, R. F., College of Agriculture, Columbus, Ohio.
Tang, C. Y., 140 Baldwin St., Athens, Ga.
Tapp, Jesse, 13 S. Mill St., Madison, Wis.
Tarble, Chas., Greenville, Ill.
Taylor, C. C., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Taylor, E. L., University Farm, Lincoln, Nebr.
Tarquhar, Fred, Malvern, Iowa.
Taylor, E. P., Anaconda Copper Co., Chicago, Ill.
Taylor, H. C., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Taylor, J. C., 723 S. 6th Ave., Bozeman, Mont.
Taylor, J. H., 411 Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C.
Taylor, Roy V., Shelbyville, Ill.
Tenny, Lloyd S., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Thiem, E. G., Morrison, Ill.
Thomas, Melvin, Charleston, Ill.
Thompson, A. L., 2012 11th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
*Thompson, G. E., Agricultural College, Tucson, Ariz.
Thompson, John, Iowa Homestead, Des Moines, Iowa.
*Thompson, S. H., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Thomson, E. H., President Federal Land Bank, Springfield, Mass.
Thorson, Theodore, Waverly, Iowa.
Tillman, B. W., Belleville, Ill.
Tolley, H. R., Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.
Tomlinson, Paul C., Malcolm, Iowa.
True, G. H., University Farm, Davis, Calif.
Tucker, D. S., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
Tucker, E. E., Rockville, Conn.
Turner, H. A., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
- Uber, J. E., 723 S. Wabash St., Chicago, Ill.
- Valgren, V. T., 1706 T St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Vaniman, V., 708 S. Douglas St., Springfield, Ill.
Van Hoesen, Fred J., Rockville, Md.
Van Norman, H. E., 426 Sta. Building, Washington, D. C.

- Van Sant, W. H., Farm Bureau, Williamsport, Pa.
Vass, A. F., College of Agriculture, Laramie, Wyo.
Vaughn, Erle C., Experiment Station, Lexington, Ky.
Vaughn, F. L., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Vaughn, M. C., Georgetown, Del.
Vaughn, R. O., 125 College Ave., Ithaca, N. Y.
Vernon, J. J., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
*Viehmann, Miss Catherine M., 456 K St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Von Tungelin, G., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
- Walker, A. L., Iowa Agricultural College, Ames, Iowa.
Wall, C. H., Delhi, N. Y.
Wallace, B. A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Wallace, H. A., care of Wallace's Farmer, Des Moines, Iowa.
Wallace, James J., R. D. No. 3, Box 80, Volant, Pa.
*Waller, Allen G., College of Agriculture, New Brunswick, N. J.
Wallin, Z. B., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Warren, D. E., Amboy, Ill.
Warren, J. A., Kouts, Ind.
Warren, G. F., College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Warwick, Geo. H., 317 Lynn Ave., Ames, Iowa.
Washburn, R. S., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Watrud, H. O., Decorah, Iowa.
Weeks, Charles R., Hays, Kans.
Wehrwein, Geo. S., 1326 Chandler St., Madison, Wis.
Weitz, Bernard O., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Weld, L. D. H., Commercial Research Department, Swift & Co.,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Whalin, C. V., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Wheeler, H. C., Lawrenceville, Ill.
Wheeler, G. A., 1333 Gallatin St., Washington, D. C.
Wheeler, H. J., 92 State St., Boston, Mass.
Wheeler, W. A., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.
Whelpton, P. K., School of Agriculture, College Station, Tex.
Whitechurch, J. E., Court House, Harrisburg, Ill.
White, G. C., 1400 Fairmont St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Wilson, R. E., Dover, Del.
Wise, L. W., Watseka, Ill.
Whitson, Jay, Harlan, Iowa.

- Wilcox, R. H., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Wilkes, Clair, 700 N. 3d St., Corvallis, Ore.
Wilkinson, F. B., 1357 Harvard St., Washington, D. C.
Willard, John D., Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
*Willard, Rex E., Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak.
Williams, C. B., University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Willingmyre, G. T., Berwyn, Md.
Wilson, Donald B., Department of Farm Crops, W. Raleigh, N. C.
Wilson Company, H. W., 958 University Ave., New York City.
*Wilson, James A., Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.
Wilson, M. C., 2900 Carlton Ave. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Wilson, M. L., Agricultural College, Bozeman, Mont.
Wilson, Warren H., Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Window, J. J., 1601 Newton St. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Winegar, F. R., Allison, Iowa.
Wing, DeWitt Cosgrove, 542 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.
Women's National Farm and Garden Association, 1728 Stevens Building, Chicago, Ill.
Wood, L. A., Loogootee, Ind.
Woods, D. C., 411 N. 2d St., Poplar Bluff, Mo.
Worsham, C. J., University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
Working, D. W., College of Agriculture, Tucson, Ariz.
Worsham, C. E. G., University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
Worsham, C. G., College of Agriculture, Brookings, S. Dak.
Woodbury, C. G., 1739 H St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Woodworth, H. C., Durham, N. H.
Wooten, E. O., Office Farm Management, Washington, D. C.
Working, Holbrook, 2153 Knapp St., St. Paul, Minn.
Working, Elmer J., Box 497, Station A, Ames, Iowa.
Wright, Ivan, Commerce Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Wright, R. V., 1919 Virginia St., Berkeley, Calif.
Wygle, C. L., Esterville, Iowa.

Yoder, Fred R., Agricultural and Mechanical College, W. Raleigh, N. C.
Yohe, H. S., Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, Washington, D. C.

- Young, E. C., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Young, H. N., Franklin Academy, Malone, N. Y.
*Young, H. P., University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Youngman, W. H., Ames, Iowa.

- Zang, Adolph, Elmwood Stock Farm, Broomfield, Colo.
Ziegler, J. F. B., Clinton, Ill.
Zimmer, E. R., 325 Gordon Ave., Syracuse, N. Y.

The JOURNAL is also sent to 55 libraries, departments of agricultural colleges, and experiment stations.

- Library, University of California, Citrus Experiment Station, Riverside, Calif.
Library, University of Nanking, Nanking, China.
Library, College of Agriculture, Ft. Collins, Colo.
Library, College of Agriculture, Peking, China.
Library, College of Agriculture, Storrs, Conn.
The John Crerar Library, Chicago, Ill. (C. W. Andrews, Lib.).
The General Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Library, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Library, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
Library, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Library, Agricultural Experiment Station, Lafayette, Ind.
Library, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Library, College of Agriculture, Manhattan, Kans.
Department of Farm Management, College of Agriculture, Lexington, Ky.
Library, College of Agriculture, Amherst, Mass.
Library, Department of Agriculture, University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
Library, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Library, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
Library, New Hampshire College, Durham, N. H.
Department of Farm Management, College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Library, College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Library, College of Agriculture, Fargo, N. Dak.
Slocum Library, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
Library, Agricultural Experiment Station, Wooster, Ohio.
Library, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ont.

- Library, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
Agricultural Library, College of Agriculture, State College, Pa.
Library, Department of Agriculture, Pretoria Union of South Africa.
Library, College of Agriculture, Knoxville, Tenn.
Division of Extension, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
Department of Rural Social Science, Agricultural College, College Station, Tex.
Library, Texas Agricultural College, Austin, Tex.
Library, State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
West Virginia Experiment Station, Morgantown, W. Va.
Library, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland, Ohio.
General Library, Agricultural College, Miss.
Library, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Library, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
Library, South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. Dak.
State College of Agriculture, Bozeman, Mont.
Library, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
United States Congressional Library, Washington, D. C.
Library, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Library, Office Farm Management and Field Economics, Washington, D. C. (U. S. Dept. of Agr.).
Library, Agricultural College, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
Library, International Institute of Agriculture, Villa Umberto I, Rome, Italy.
Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Library, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore.
Librarian, Department of Agriculture, Pretoria, Union of South Africa.
College of Agriculture, Los Banos, Laguna, Philippine Islands.
Library, Experiment Station, Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.
Library, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ont.

FARM ECONOMIC NEWS NOTES.

During the past winter the first farm management short course ever held in Illinois was conducted by the Clinton County Farm Bureau. Forty farmers and farm boys spent five days studying soil fertility, crop rotations, livestock production, dairying, and poultry production under the direction of specialists from the University of Illinois. The relation of each of these fields of study to farm management was pointed out and the salient features emphasized. The students worked out cropping systems adapted to their individual farms, replanned the field system to fit the cropping systems outlined, and studied the general principles of efficient organization and operation as applied to the business of farming.

Farm accounting was featured the last day. Mr. Rehling, the farm adviser, plans to make this the basis for his project in farm organization which he expects to carry on in coöperation with a large number of farm bureau members in 1922 and succeeding years.

A new course, entitled farm operation, has been given during the first semester of this year by the Farm Management Department of the University of Illinois.

This course includes a study of the principles of efficiency as developed by industrial engineers, and their application to farming; the important factors which determine the net farm income; labor supply, standards, requirements, and labor calendars; farm power requirements for belt and drawbar work, sources of power, comparative costs of the various sources, and the most efficient utilization of farm power.

The investigational work in farm management at the Arkansas College of Agriculture during the past year has been entirely in gathering labor data to be used as basic factors in cost accounting, and in getting the seasonal distribution of labor data as a means of helping to plan the work of the farm. These data cover all of the important crops of Arkansas, and in the cases of cotton, corn, and a few other crops the data are given for more than one part of the State. These data will be used later in the extension work.

Mr. Turner Wright, formerly the Marketing Specialist for Arkansas, is now manager of the Arkansas Sweet Potato Growers' Association and is distributing Arkansas Sweets far and near.

Mr. Thomas H. Summers, formerly of the Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, has been appointed the farm management demonstrator in Colorado. He reported for duty on March 16.

The Division of Farm Engineering of the West Virginia College of Agriculture has been placed in the Department of Farm Economics. Mr. F. D. Cornell, a graduate of Syracuse University, has been placed in charge of this work.

The Department of Agricultural Economics of the University of Tennessee, under the direction of Professor C. E. Allred, is this year offering for the first time a course in Rural Sociology. The course in Farm Cost Accounting is proving to be one of the most popular courses at the Tennessee Agricultural College, the enrollment in that subject this year being almost double that of last year.

Mr. Ralph Loomis has resigned his position as Extension Specialist in Marketing at the University of Missouri and is taking a theological course at Oberlin, Ohio. His place on the Extension staff at Missouri has not yet been filled.

Mr. Paul Mehl, who for two years was Extension Agent in Marketing in Oregon, took up his duties as Extension Agent in Marketing in Connecticut in October, 1921. Mr. Mehl has just completed a survey of the costs of operating grain and feed stores in Connecticut. A copy of his general report on the first phase of this project is to be in the *Flour and Feed* magazine of March, 1922.

The Economics Department of the Connecticut Agricultural College is conducting a study of the methods employed by farmers in marketing eggs.

At a recent meeting of the New England Association of Marketing Officials, held in Boston, W. A. Munson, Director of the Massachu-

setts Bureau of Markets, was elected president; Andrew Felker, Commissioner of Agriculture of New Hampshire, was elected vice-president, and I. G. Davis, Professor of Economics of the Connecticut Agricultural College, secretary-treasurer for the ensuing year.

Delaware has no Department of Farm Management in the University or Agricultural Experiment Station. The instructional work in Farm Management is in charge of the Department of Agronomy and Farm Management Extension work is on a part-time basis in charge of County Agent Leader, M. O. Pence, acting as farm management demonstrator. During the past winter we have held in each county one or more one-day farm account schools at which the farmers were given a sample farm record including receipts, expenses, and opening and closing inventories. The labor income is worked out along with factors of efficiency in labor and in crop and livestock enterprises. We hope as a result of these meetings to get a number of farmers in these communities to keep their own records, which will be summarized a year hence.

Publicity material along the line of farm economics is prepared regularly for the Monthly Extension Service News, and in the absence of a Marketing Specialist considerable aid of an advisory nature has been given to farmers' produce associations and the farmers' co-operative elevator movement. The latter is entirely new in this State.

During the winter of 1921-22 ninety-seven farm management schools, with an attendance of 4,587, were held in Minnesota. The subjects taken up at the schools were on the cost of producing butterfat, potatoes, corn, pork, and wheat. Those who assisted in conducting the schools in addition to W. L. Cavert, the farm management demonstrator, and various county agents, were Director of Extension F. W. Peck, Professor Andrew Boss, Mr. R. E. Hodgson, Superintendent of the Waseca Station, assistant county agent leaders S. B. Cleland, F. J. Brown, W. J. Corwin, and assistant professors G. A. Pond and L. F. Garey.

The first research work to be started by the new Department of Economics and Sociology of the Colorado College of Agriculture since its establishment in January of this year will be with a group of twenty-five farmers. These farmers will keep accurate cost ac-

counts of all farm operations during the next few years. This work will bring together definite information in reference to labor operations on different farm enterprises, farm expenses relating to crops and live stock, and the returns from these sources at the end of the year. Professor L. A. Moorhouse, of the Department of Economics and Sociology, and who was formerly with the Office of Farm Management of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, will supervise this work. Mr. George Knutson, of the same department, will carry on the route work and visit each of the farms included in the project at least twice and, if possible, three times a month.

A new Department of Farm Economics has recently been established at the South Dakota College of Agriculture to handle some research work along farm management lines and the teaching of certain courses. Teaching work commences this spring term with the giving of a course in the marketing of agricultural products. Courses in farm management and agricultural economics are being developed for next year.

In coöperation with the State Department of Agriculture cost of production work on farm products is being done. A cost route of twenty farms has been established at Oldham, with Mr. C. G. Worsham, formerly of the Minnesota College of Agriculture, in charge. Several farm surveys in representative sections of the State, which it is planned to continue for several years, are being made. About fifty individual coöperative labor, feed, and financial records are being kept with farmers throughout the State. A study of the local live-stock shipping costs is being made in coöperation with the Bureau of Markets, United States Department of Agriculture.

New personnel in the Department of Farm Economics, South Dakota College of Agriculture, include the following: Mr. C. G. Worsham, formerly with the Cost of Production Division, Minnesota College of Agriculture; Miss Mathilda Marshall, formerly statistician, Minnesota College of Agriculture; Mr. Harold Hedges, who graduated from the Farm Management Section of the University of Nebraska in 1921; Miss Ethel Van Cleve, formerly with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and Mr. Charles Krahler, formerly route statistician for the Minnesota College of Agriculture.

Mr. J. D. Black, Chief of the Division of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, will be on leave of absence from April 1

to July 1 while undertaking supervision of some research work with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in Washington. During his absence Dr. H. B. Price will be in charge of the Division.

Mr. G. C. Haas, University of Minnesota, on April 1 joins the staff of the Division of Land Economics of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to work on the problem of land valuation. Mr. Haas has just completed a multiple correlation study of the factors determining land values in Blue Earth County, Minnesota.

Dr. H. B. Price is being assisted in the project in cost of marketing live stock which is being carried on by the Minnesota College of Agriculture in coöperation with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics by Mr. E. W. Gaumnitz, Mr. Paul Miller, and Mr. B. A. Holt.

The Seminar work in marketing during the spring and summer quarters, University of Minnesota, will be devoted to carrying forward to completion the survey of the marketing of agricultural products in the Twin Cities. The seminar group working on this problem during the spring quarter will consist of twenty graduate students.

The summer session work in Agricultural Economics at the University of Minnesota will be conducted by Dr. H. B. Price, Dr. Holbrook Working, Mr. C. F. Clayton, and Mr. Warren C. Waite. Professor Fred C. Garver of the School of Business, will assist by offering work in Economic Theory on the Main University Campus.

Mr. Walter V. Kell, formerly county agent in Indiana, has been appointed as assistant in the Farm Management Extension work, Purdue University. Mr. Kell is a graduate of the University of Illinois, and besides being in county extension work for five years, has spent several years as manager of large farms.

Dr. L. C. Gray, of the Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, and Mr. Nat C. Murray, Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, sailed April 20 to represent the United States at the General Assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture which convenes at Rome May 8.

A year of great activity under the Federal Warehouse Act has just closed. Beginning in April, 1921, warehousemen, previously rather indifferent even to the existence of the Act, have been hastening to avail themselves of its benefits, which extend back from the warehouse to the farmer, and on from the warehouse to the banker. Although the Act was passed in 1916, comparatively few warehouses were licensed federally during the first few years. Much educational work was necessary until the agricultural conditions following the war drove the lessons home. By April, 1922, however, more than 560 warehouses were so licensed and many applications were pending.

Dr. W. J. Spillman, formerly Chief of the Office of Farm Management, is spending several months with the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, where he is making a series of special studies at the request of Dr. H. C. Taylor, Chief of the Bureau.

Chris Lauriths Christensen, who will complete his study and work on a fellowship with the University of Copenhagen on June 1, 1922, has consented to make a study of the coöperative movement in Denmark for the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. Negotiations are under way for the temporary appointment of Mr. Christensen.

The Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, in coöperation with the Vermont College of Agriculture, has begun a continued farm business analysis survey of dairy farms in Vermont. Messrs. W. C. Funk and Bruce McKinley compose the part from the Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics.

The Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, in coöperation with the Montana College of Agriculture, will begin a continued survey in the dry land farming areas of north-central Montana. Special attention will be paid to getting details of the organization of the most successful types of farming followed in that region.

An index to current prices is being prepared in the Library of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. In April, prices had been indexed on nearly 1,100 commodities in the United States and on 175 in foreign countries. Fifty-seven periodicals, newspapers, and price quotation sheets had been covered.

Through the interest and enthusiasm of Dr. H. C. Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, representatives of widely differing schools of thought have spoken before the staff of the United States Department of Agriculture during the past winter. The speakers included Drs. Carver and Cole of Harvard, Drs. Ely and Hibbard of Wisconsin, Dr. Cance of Amherst, President Bizzell of the Texas Agricultural College, and Mr. G. Harold Powell, then General Manager of the California Fruit Growers' Exchange.

Governor Cameron Morrison, of North Carolina, has appointed a commission, headed by Dr. B. F. Brown, Chief, Division of Markets of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, to make a study and to report on farm tenancy in North Carolina.

This commission has agreed to make an initial, intensive study, coöperating with the Section of Land Economics, under the direction of Dr. L. C. Gray, and the Section of Rural Life Studies, under the direction of Dr. C. J. Galpin, of the Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics. The plan is to study a thousand farms in three representative areas: one area to be studied under the direction of Dr. E. C. Branson, of the University of North Carolina; the second under the direction of Dr. C. C. Taylor, of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture; the third under the direction of Professor E. C. Lindeman, of the North Carolina College for Women, Greensboro.

After the intensive study of the thousand farms, it is expected that a few outstanding situations will be discovered which will be used as the basis for the second step of the study, namely, a state-wide investigation. It is expected that the report will recommend legislation based upon the whole inquiry.

Standardization studies in progress in the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates include such commodities as wool, live stock and dressed meats, tobacco, fruits and vegetables, dairy products and hay. Containers for fruits and vegetables, federally standardized in part, are ready for further legislation, and studies beyond the recommended standards are under way. The Bureau is slowly formulating the principles that should underlie all agricultural standardization work and is developing toward uniformity in federal standardization. Cotton, wheat, shelled corn, and oats are already standardized by laws enforced by the Bureau.

The Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is conducting a series of test shipments of fruit through the Panama Canal under varying planned conditions of temperature, ventilation, and other factors. Investigators accompany the trips and make constant records of conditions which are correlated with the condition of the fruit on arrival. Tentative results of these trips are given to the cooperating state departments, shippers, and shippers' organizations.

THE WASHINGTON LOCAL A. F. E. A.

A District of Columbia Section of the American Farm Economic Association was organized March 9. More than forty persons interested in farm economics were present at this meeting. Dr. O. C. Stine presided. Dr. Henry C. Taylor outlined the history and work of the national association. Mr. Nat C. Murray, chief statistician of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, told of a previous organization of the kind that existed in Washington during the years 1913 and 1914 under the name of the Rural Economic Society. Dr. W. J. Spillman also spoke on early days in farm economics work. The following officers were elected: President, Dr. C. L. Stewart, economist in the Office of Farm Management and Farm Economics; Vice-President, Miss Caroline B. Sherman, assistant in market information, and Secretary, Mr. Charles Bohannon, economist, both of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates.

